

honor of Mr. MANN have been concluded. I ask that an order to that effect be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30 REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, the following Senate concurrent resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

##### Senate Concurrent Resolution 30.

Whereas Joseph Battell, late of Middlebury, county of Addison, State of Vermont, deceased, in and by his last will and testament devised to the Government of the United States of America about 3,900 acres of land situated in the towns of Lincoln and Warren, in the State of Vermont, for a national park; and

Whereas said lands were devised to the United States of America upon certain conditions, among which were the following: That the Government should construct and maintain suitable roads and buildings upon the land constituting such national park for the use and accommodation of visitors to such park, and should employ suitable caretakers to the end and purpose that the woodland should be properly cared for and preserved so far as possible in its primitive beauty; and

Whereas it is deemed inexpedient to accept such devise and to establish a national park in accordance with the terms thereof: Therefore be it Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the acceptance of said devise so made by Joseph Battell in his last will and testament be declined by the Government of the United States, and that the estate of the said Joseph Battell be forever discharged from any obligation to the United States growing out of the devise before mentioned.

—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following Senate joint resolution was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

Senate Joint Resolution 218, to create a commission to consider the proposal of a central building for art and industry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KING, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of sickness.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until Wednesday, December 27, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3220. An act amending sections 2, 5, 11, 12, 15, 19, 29, and 30 of the United States warehouse act, approved August 11, 1916; with amendments (Rept. No. 1317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LEATHERWOOD: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1829. An act for the relief of Walter Runke; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PARKS of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 13571) to amend section 71 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 13572) to increase the limit of cost of the post-office building to be erected at Cohoes, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 13573) to determine proceedings in cases of contested elections of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 13574) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument at Fort Pierre, S. Dak., to commemorate the explorations and discoveries of the Verendrye brothers, and to expend not to exceed \$25,000 therefor; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13575) to provide seed wheat for the drought-stricken area in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 13576) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Wray; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 13577) granting a pension to Ella Kinser Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 13578) granting a pension to George H. Burton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 13579) for the relief of Thomas F. Madden; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6678. By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: Petition of K. Jacobs and 80 other residents of Pontiac, Mich., protesting against Turkish atrocities and requesting the Federal Government to initiate measures to restrain further violence in this respect; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6679. By Mr. KISSEL: Petition of the Bronx Board of Trade, in the city of New York, N. Y., urging a central post office; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6680. By Mr. LEA of California: Petition of 42 residents of the State of California, favoring the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6681. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of Mr. Lyle L. Putney and 13 other residents of Arcadia, Mich., favoring the abolition of the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, December 27, 1922.

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Thou hast cared for us through the night season and hast granted us health and strength for the day and its duties. We look unto Thee this morning, asking that Thy guidance may be had and that every phase of life as presented to us may receive that kind consideration, that we may become more helpful in these days of need and of manifold problems, and finally receive Thine approbation. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

MEDILL McCORMICK, a Senator from the State of Illinois, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### SENATOR FROM ARIZONA.

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST], which have just been received. I ask that they may be read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1922, HENRY F. ASHURST was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arizona a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Arizona. Done at the city of Phoenix, the capital, this 21st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1922.

[SEAL.]

By the acting governor:

ERNEST R. HALL.

JOHN MCK. REDMOND,  
Assistant Secretary of State.

#### SENATOR FROM NEW MEXICO.

Mr. BURSUM. Mr. President, I present the certificate of election of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], certified by the governor, and ask to have the same read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:



STATE OF NEW MEXICO,  
Executive Department.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, in the year 1922, ANDRIEUS A. JONES, Esq., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of New Mexico a Senator from said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1923.

Witness: His excellency our governor, Merritt C. Mechem, and our seal hereto affixed, this 1st day of December, in the year of our Lord 1922.

[SEAL.]

By the governor:

MERRITT C. MECHEM.

EDITH WILEMAN,  
Assistant Secretary of State.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MYERS presented resolutions adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Teton County, Mont., favoring the enactment of legislation for the taxation of unpatented lands on Government reclamation projects, which were referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. CAPPER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bison and vicinity, in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation creating a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Pleasant Valley Local No. 652, Farmers' Union, of Lawrence, Kans., indorsing the rural credit bills pending in Congress, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Pleasant Valley Local No. 652, Farmers' Union, of Lawrence, Kans., protesting against the passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LADD presented the memorial of J. D. Myers and 19 other citizens, of Raub, N. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called ship subsidy bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of George Kugler and 30 other citizens, of Fairmount, N. Dak., praying for the passage of legislation repealing the discriminatory tax on small-arms ammunition and firearms, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Edgar Wagar and 21 other citizens, of McHenry County, N. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to stabilize the prices of farm products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED.

Mr. SUTHERLAND, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 23, 1922, they presented the following enrolled bills to the President of the United States:

S. 3275. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil and Mexican Wars and to certain widows, Army nurses, former widows, minor children, and helpless children of said soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to widows of the War of 1812, and to certain Indian war veterans and widows, and to certain maimed soldiers, sailors, and marines; and

S. 4100. An act to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 4232) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a contract with the Elephant Butte irrigation district, of New Mexico, and the El Paso County improvement district No. 1, of Texas, for the carrying out of the provisions of the convention between the United States and Mexico, proclaimed January 16, 1907, and providing compensation therefor; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

A bill (S. 4233) to provide for the appointment to higher grades of certain Army officers having conspicuously superior records; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 4234) granting a pension to Lillian H. Corcoran; to the Committee on Pensions.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT TO INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ODDIE submitted an amendment providing for bringing 4,887 acres of Paiute Indian lands in the State of Nevada within the provisions and benefits of a drainage district, or-

ganized pursuant to the laws of said State, for the purpose of draining the lands within the Newlands irrigation project, and appropriating \$2,500 for the purpose of paying the first installment assessable against said Indian lands, etc., intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13559, the Interior Department appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment providing that the enlisted forces of the Navy shall not exceed 67,000 men, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13374, the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to reduce the appropriation for pay of the Navy from \$121,446,892 to \$91,446,892, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 13374, the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. REED of Missouri submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the so-called Borah amendment proposed to be submitted to the naval appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of the Borah amendment the following: "The President is requested to at once cause the return to the United States of all American troops now stationed in Germany."

PROPOSED SILVER COMMISSION.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I submit a concurrent resolution and ask that it may be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) was read, as follows:

Whereas the production of silver in the United States is a large and important industry affecting the welfare of important communities and of a large number of citizens; and

Whereas the United States has throughout its history favored silver as an important element of its monetary system and now views with anxiety the recent tendency of many influential nations of the world to lessen the use of silver as money, in some cases by ceasing its coinage for subsidiary and fractional denominations, in other cases by diminishing the silver contents of coins of the same nominal value; and

Whereas such tendencies, if unchecked, will have a serious and far-reaching effect upon the monetary customs of the world and will directly and indirectly injure one of the world's greatest industries, that of mining; and

Whereas the subject is a complex one, requiring the investigation of many abstruse and difficult problems and their consideration by many nations: Now therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the President of the United States appoint a commission of nine, to be known as a "silver commission," of whom not more than three shall be Members of the United States Senate and not more than three shall be Members of the United States House of Representatives; that such commission be authorized to communicate with such nations as may be feasible, either individually or in a joint conference to be arranged for that purpose; that such commission shall use its influence toward the resumption of the use of silver in the various monetary systems of nations which have abandoned or lessened its use and shall also lend its influence toward the adoption of any step that may tend to stabilize the value of silver in the world's market; that the commission after such investigation and conferences as it may deem advisable shall report to the President its recommendations and findings; that no compensation shall be allowed to any member of such commission as such, but the actual necessary expenses of the commission shall be borne by the United States.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I move that the concurrent resolution be referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

The motion was agreed to.

THE RULES OF THE SENATE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I submitted on Friday Senate Resolution 385. It is on the table, I understand.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is on the table calendar.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that it may still lie on the table, going over for the day. There is other business to come up this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request will be granted.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that on December 27, 1922, the President approved and signed the act (S. 4100) to amend section 9 of the trading with the enemy act as amended.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. HARRISON subsequently said: Mr. President, while it is very true that we are on the naval appropriation bill we can not lose sight of the important fight that is to proceed at an early date, I presume, touching ship subsidy.

A few days ago, on Tuesday, December 19, appearing in the Washington Post and other papers throughout the country—I read from the Washington Post—there was a statement issued



by Mr. Lasker, chairman of the Shipping Board, in which he said—I read from the headlines of the Washington Post—

Lasker denounces CAPPER's ship fight.

Statements published in Senator's paper declared biased and "at variance with facts."

Denies chief statements.

Says they were made on strength of minority report and are wholly erroneous.

The statement has been incorporated in the RECORD heretofore, but I desire to ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD, so that those who are studying the ship subsidy bill may get some facts from it, this statement in the form of a letter from Congressman DAVIS of Tennessee, a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House, to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. I may say that Mr. DAVIS, in my opinion, is one of the best-versed men in the Congress touching this proposed ship subsidy legislation. He has given great thought to the question, and I am sure that he has sufficiently answered the chairman of the Shipping Board in this correspondence. I think it ought to be incorporated in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

DECEMBER 20, 1922.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I note that Chairman Lasker, of the Shipping Board, has written you a letter, which he gave to the press, in which he takes you to task by reason of the fact that Capper's Weekly is conducting a poll on the ship subsidy bill and because the questionnaire accompanying the ballots contains a statement of the issue which does not wholly meet the approval of Mr. Lasker. In other words, Chairman Lasker takes exception to the fact that you have not swallowed without question all of the false propaganda which he has been busily engaged in preparing and disseminating, at least in part at Government expense, instead of attending to his official duties; the statute creating the Shipping Board provides that "each commissioner shall devote his time to the duties of his office."

Mr. Lasker has the temerity to upbraid you because the questionnaire mentioned contained even a modicum of the argument and facts against the bill, although it contained a much fuller statement in favor of the bill, stated as strongly as any proponent of the bill has stated it, and occupying nearly three times as much space in the questionnaire as the only statement therein which can be construed as against the bill.

The fact of the business is that opponents of this bill have infinitely more cause for complaint against said questionnaire than has Chairman Lasker.

The statement in the questionnaire from Capper's Weekly for which Chairman Lasker upbraids you, and which he incorporates in his letter, is as follows:

"1. Do you favor a ship subsidy? In order to stop \$50,000,000 annual expense of the United States Shipping Board, to get the Government out of the shipping business, to make possible the sale of our Government-owned ships, to make it possible for ships under the American flag to compete with those under foreign flags it is proposed that the people, through their Government, shall sell the ships of their war-built merchant fleet for approximately \$200,000,000, lend one hundred and twenty-five million to recondition the ships or build others, and then pay the owners about \$750,000,000 in subsidies and aids within the next 10 years. A clause provides that when a ship has earned 10 per cent of its investment half of its earnings shall revert to the subsidy fund until the full subsidies it has been paid are returned. President Harding advocates the subsidy plan as the cheapest way for the Government to get out of the shipping business. He believes an American merchant marine would greatly develop our foreign commerce."

Mr. Lasker further asserts in his letter:

"The statements as to the workings of the subsidy bill made in your circular are all taken from the minority House report prepared by Mr. DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee, a partisan report which everyone Washington wise knows was prepared for political purposes and is unjustified by the facts; your words are taken, practically syllable for syllable, from this partisan minority report."

I emphatically deny that the major portion of the statement in the questionnaire is taken from the House minority report or that it represents my views or that of any other Member who signed such report. On the other hand, the statement that "in order to stop \$50,000,000 annual expense of the United States Shipping Board, to get the Government out of the shipping business, to make possible the sale of our Government-owned ships, to make it possible for ships under the American flag to compete with those under foreign flags it is proposed," is not only not in accord with the House minority report but each and every one of those contentions is denied and disproved in the said minority report, as was also done in speeches delivered in the House by all of us who signed the minority report.

The questionnaire contains the following statement: "A clause provides that when a ship has earned 10 per cent of its investment half of its earnings shall revert to the subsidy fund until the full subsidies it has been paid are returned." While this is one of the chief arguments of the proponents of the bill and stated in the manner in which it is usually stated, yet under provisions of the bill the only subsidies which would be so returned would be for the current year and not any subsidies which had been paid in previous years. Furthermore, it is insisted by those opposed to this bill that there would be no refunds under this provision, for the reason that any surplus would be taken up in salaries, through subsidiary companies, etc., in order to avoid a refund.

It will be noted that this questionnaire directs the readers' attention to the fact that "President Harding advocates the subsidy plan as the cheapest way for the Government to get out of the shipping business. He believes an American merchant marine would greatly develop our foreign commerce." This is naturally calculated to largely influence the voter to whom the questionnaire is sent.

In fact, your questionnaire was more than fair to the bill and its advocates. As the readers of your papers are largely farmers, it would have been entirely proper for you to have called attention to the fact that this bill is not drafted or designed in the interest of cargo carriers, in which the farmers are interested, as has been conclusively and irrefutably shown. You could have well explained that this bill conferred more power on Chairman Lasker and his associates than good men ought to want or that bad men ought to be given.

The portion of said questionnaire which seems to have so riled Chairman Lasker is as follows:

"It is proposed: That the people, through their Government, shall sell the ships of their war-built merchant fleet for approximately \$200,000,000, lend \$125,000,000 to recondition the ships or build others, and then pay the owners about \$750,000,000 in subsidies and aids within the next 10 years."

Mr. Lasker states: "I challenge one to find where the Shipping Board has ever proposed that the war-built merchant fleet be sold for approximately \$200,000,000." I accept that challenge.

The Shipping Board advertised the sale of the entire Government fleet last February. The New York Tribune of February 18, 1922, contained a front-page article which reads in part as follows:

"UNITED STATES TO SELL 1,470 SHIPS NEXT TUESDAY—ENTIRE MERCHANT FLEET, FROM 'LEVIATHAN' TO TUGS OFFERED—PROCEEDS FIGURED AT \$200,000,000—SUCCESS DEPENDS ON SUBSIDY'S PASSAGE—READY MARKET AT TOP PRICES ASSURED IF CONGRESS ADOPTS HARDING'S PLAN."

"WASHINGTON, February 17.—The entire fleet of merchant ships owned by the United States Government will be offered for sale on February 21 it was announced to-day by Joseph W. Powell, president of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. The total of 1,470 vessels included is expected to net the Government close to \$200,000,000, or an average of \$20 a ton."

"All classes and types of vessels will be included in the sale, in the expectation that if the administration's proposed subsidy bill is passed by Congress the ships will find a ready market and assure a large, permanent American merchant marine."

The New York Tribune is a loyal supporter of the administration and of this ship subsidy bill. Articles similar to the above appeared in the press generally at the time.

I made a speech in the House of Representatives February 21, 1922, in which I read the Tribune article in full and commented thereon. Representative HARDY of Texas followed with a speech on the same subject, in which he, among other things, stated: "The proposition goes out that the Shipping Board or the Emergency Fleet Corporation propose to sell those ships at a round sum of \$200,000,000." In fact, since said publications purporting to be an official announcement from the Shipping Board that it was expected that our fleet could be sold for approximately \$200,000,000, in the event of the passage of this bill, it has been generally accepted as the expected sale price, and has been so mentioned by various speakers and writers, and, so far as I have seen or heard, Mr. Lasker's letter to you is the first instance in which he or any other member of the Shipping Board has questioned the correctness of such statements.

The statute required that those ships should be duly appraised before sale, and during the hearings on this bill the Shipping Board was requested to file such appraisal for the information of the committee and the Congress, but Chairman Lasker, through Commissioner Lissner, refused to file it, as appears on page 840 of the hearings, as follows:

"Mr. LISSNER. Reference was also made to the appraisals of these ships that were mentioned in the advertisement. The chairman has requested me to say to the committee that he regards it as against the interest of the public and as having a very detrimental effect if these figures should go into the record. They were simply informal appraisals that were made for the information of the board itself, and, in our opinion, they should not go into the record or be handed in here at all."

Although admittedly there was no sale for the ships at the time and the bids received therefor were described by Chairman Lasker as "facetious"—"a joke" (hearings, p. 47), Commissioner Lissner of the Shipping Board admitted at the hearings (pp. 989-990) that "one of the purposes of the advertisement was to put ourselves in the position where we could sell the ships, having said we had advertised them." In other words, the statute provides that the ships shall be sold "at public or private competitive sale after appraisalment and due advertisement." The Shipping Board took the position that having advertised the entire fleet for sale on a certain day was such compliance with the requirement for "due advertisement," that they could for a reasonable time thereafter sell any of the ships at private sale without further advertisement.

As to another purpose of said advertised sale, I call attention to the following from page 990 of the hearings:

"Mr. DAVIS. I want to ask you if another purpose of this advertised sale was not that you would receive bids for certain vessels of different types, and that that could be taken as a proper criterion upon which you would be justified in selling other ships subsequently at private sale at the same price?"

"Mr. LISSNER. It was the hope of the board that the bids that would come would be sufficiently illuminating and reliable so that we could make an estimate of the sales value of the ships; yes, sir."

"Mr. DAVIS. For future sales?"

"Mr. LISSNER. Yes, sir."

It was the contention of Chairman Lasker and other representatives of the Shipping Board at the hearings that our ships should be sold at not exceeding world market prices for similar tonnage, and that such world market price for first-class cargo vessels is about \$30 per ton or less. The large study prepared under the direction of the Shipping Board and widely distributed, states their position as follows:

"The Shipping Board should sell its remaining fleet as rapidly as possible at prices not to exceed the prevailing world market price for similar tonnage (p. 3).

"Moreover, it is clear that the sale of these ships to American owners on the proposed basis would merely tend to put those ships on a parity with similar foreign ships with respect to the first cost or book value and the fixed charges based thereon" (p. 83).

As evidence of the fact that this proposed sale only has reference to the half of our ships which Chairman Lasker estimated to be good ships, this same study declares:

"To achieve a balanced fleet then would involve the elimination of 3,000,000 gross tons (5,000,000 dead-weight tons) of cargo ships" (p. 40).



Upon the same subject, I call attention to the following extracts from the original statement of Chairman Lasker at the hearings (p. 7):

"Of our 6,000,000 tons of freighters, about half the steel tonnage is good tonnage—comparable to the best in the world. The other half ranges from fair to not usable for purposes and should be either sold abroad in such trades where we have every assurance it will not find itself in competition with our ships, or dismantled."

"Of the 6,000,000 tons of freighters the Government possesses it is the hope of the Shipping Board that ultimately a great measure of the 3,000,000 good tons will find itself in the hands of American owners, should the legislation here proposed be adopted. It is doubtful if, under the happiest conditions, the American flag will need the 3,000,000 good tons in its entirety, and ways and means must be found to dispose of such of the good tonnage as remains, so that American interests will not be hurt. Under no circumstances must the surplus good tonnage that America can not absorb be disposed of so as to bankrupt those who buy from the Government at current prices."

"Automatically the 3,000,000 poor tons must be done away with. Part of it can be used by selling to Americans the hulls at low figures for conversion to types of freighters of which we are not possessed. The balance may either be sold in small quantities in local trades abroad if any, where, because of shorter runs and cheaper labor, local operation may be possible, or it must largely be dismantled."

"It is the unneeded surplus, in ships as in all else, that determines the market, and the same circumstances that forced some farmers to burn their corn last winter demands that, at least so far as the uneconomical 3,000,000 tons of freighters go, we recognize that one of our problems is to force its disappearance from the market."

In further discussing the half of our tonnage which Chairman Lasker describes as from fair to useless, he says: "It is a very imprudent business man who fools himself on his assets. \* \* \* Why should we swindle Americans by selling them ships that would only bankrupt them? It is unconscionable and the Government should not place itself in such a position" (p. 60).

Mr. Lasker correctly explains that 6,000,000 gross tons are equivalent to 10,000,000 dead-weight tons, and that ships are sold on a dead-weight ton basis. On cross-examination at the hearings he was questioned at length in regard to the value and anticipated sale price of our tonnage, and I quote from his testimony, as follows:

"Mr. LASKER. The world price on our good tonnage to-day is about \$30."

"Mr. HARDY. You mean that there is 10,000,000 tons that is worth \$30 a ton?"

"Mr. LASKER. There is 5,000,000 dead weight that is worth \$30 per ton if you can sell it. We have been willing to sell it at \$30 per ton for some months now, and we have been able to sell exactly 100,000 tons at that price (p. 27)."

"Mr. DAVIS. Now, Mr. Lasker, I assume that you and your associates have made some sort of estimate as to what you would hope to realize out of our fleet in the event this bill goes through?"

"Mr. LASKER. I have answered that at such-length to the judge and to Mr. BRIGGS that I can not think of a new way to answer it."

"Mr. DAVIS. It was stated in the press some time ago, purporting to come from members of the Shipping Board, that \$200,000,000 was expected to be realized. Is that substantially correct?"

"Mr. LASKER. I would not stand back of that figure. I do not know. It is in the womb of the future. If you do not give us this legislation, you will never get this \$200,000,000; if you give us this legislation, you may get more. How much I don't know" (pp. 236-237).

"Mr. DAVIS. In other words, it would be 5,000,000 dead-weight tons, at \$30?"

"Mr. LASKER. Yes; that is it—well, wait; it would be 5,000,000, if \$30 is what we get."

"Mr. DAVIS. Have you any real hope of realizing more than that on the average?"

"Mr. LASKER. No; it is in the womb of the future. I don't want to be a prophet; I am no good at crystal gazing." (Hearings, 237.)

Neither Chairman Lasker nor any other representative of the Shipping Board could be persuaded to place any market value on the 5,000,000 dead-weight tons which they described as from fair to useless, nor would any of them make any estimate as to what they expected to realize upon this tonnage, even if the bill passed. However, in view of their pronounced policy of eliminating those ships by scrapping, dismantling, or otherwise disposing of them in such manner that they could not come in competition with the first-class tonnage and the other privately owned tonnage, it is quite evident that but a small amount could and would be realized upon same. It would certainly be a liberal estimate to say that same could thus be disposed of on an average of \$10 per dead-weight ton, which would net \$50,000,000. Assuming that the Shipping Board should be fortunate enough to sell this tonnage practically for junk at this price, and that they should sell all of the 5,000,000 dead-weight first-class tonnage at \$30, they would only receive \$200,000,000 for the total tonnage.

It appears clearly in the hearings that the hoped for price of \$30 per ton is dependent upon the passage of this bill and also improved world conditions. Chairman Lasker and other proponents of the bill state repeatedly that there is practically no sale for our ships now at any price. On the same occasion in which Mr. Lasker testified as to the value and sale price of the tonnage, he declared that "at the present time there is, by and large, no market for our vast tonnage" (p. 13).

And he further stated "we can not sell ships to-day at all" (p. 230). I also call attention to Mr. Lasker's testimony as to the intended sale of our ships appearing on pages 29 and 31 of the hearings.

W. J. Love, one of the \$35,000 experts and a vice president of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, stated at the hearings that he thought that our ships ought to be put on the market and sold for whatever they would bring regardless of price, even though our ships might thus fall into the hands of one large combination, after which he was questioned, and testified as follows:

"Mr. BRIGGS. I am speaking about the price the Government can get for its fleet. Suppose the bids came in—if this bill should pass—and the bids made were of about the same character as those recently made for the fleet, and it was thought then that Congress intended that the fleet should be sold and put into the hands of private operators at the best price the board could get. They would have to sell it?"

"Mr. LOVE. Then you are going to end all the good that is done, because if you are going to hold it and sell it at the value established after the subsidy is made a law you are going to put into the hands of the private operators ships at a higher cost and put another burden on them."

"Mr. BRIGGS. You don't think that ought to be done?"

"Mr. LOVE. Let them sell the ships at the best price they can get for them now and start over like everybody else starts."

"Mr. BRIGGS. Well, it is generally conceded that nobody now wants ships. That is true, isn't it?"

"Mr. LOVE. That is true."

"Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Lasker has testified here that the bids they received were facetious. He regarded them as a joke."

"Mr. LOVE. That is true" (pp. 862-863).

H. H. Raymond, president of the American Steamship Owners' Association, after having stated that he did not think any ships could be sold now, was asked as to whether he would favor selling any of them until after the bill is passed, and he replied: "I would say emphatically that I would sell every darn ship that the Government has got as fast as I could and get the Government out of business" (pp. 987-988).

Similar views were expressed by other shipowners. As they have controlled the policies of the Shipping Board thus far, it may be reasonably presumed that they will do so in the future.

As a matter of fact, if this bill passes and the disposition of our fleet is left to the present Shipping Board I am convinced that it will not be sold for anything near as much as \$200,000,000. In fact, the Shipping Board has sold several 4,100-dead-weight-ton steamers of best quality for \$76,000 each, and have announced this as a fixed price for steamers of this type; that is, \$18.53 per ton.

Mr. Lasker does not deny that it is proposed to lend \$125,000,000 "to recondition the ships or build others." His comment on this is so utterly unfair and childish that it does not deserve notice.

As to the amount of the subsidies and aids provided in the bill, Chairman Lasker repeats the false statements, which he had iterated and reiterated, after having on cross-examination admitted the falsity of same; and he persists in resorting to the sophistry of discussing only the direct-voyage subsidies, as if that was all the burdens imposed by the bill. After considerable cross-examination, appearing on pages 239 to 242 and on pages 271 to 276 of the hearings, Mr. Lasker finally testified as follows:

"Mr. LASKER. Let me see, now, I think we can get a quick meeting of the minds."

"The total cost to the Treasury if the bill ever becomes highly successful in operating, so that we have an adequate merchant marine for peace and war, will be: Customs, \$30,000,000; tonnage, \$4,000,000; income tax, \$10,000,000; construction, \$3,000,000; and postage, \$5,000,000."

"Mr. DAVIS. How much does that add up—\$52,000,000?"

"Mr. LASKER. That will add up \$52,000,000."

This enumeration does not include certain indirect aids which Mr. Lasker was unable to estimate, although Mr. Lasker did say that the indirect aids were more valuable than the direct aids. Nor does it include the benefit to private shipowners by reason of elimination of the Army and Navy transport services, Mr. Lasker estimating that the net earnings to privately owned lines from this business in the Pacific alone would amount to approximately \$5,000,000. Nor does it include benefits to the shipowners which do not involve a burden upon the Public Treasury, such as the provision requiring one-half of the emigrants to come in American-flag ships, which Mr. Rosbottom estimated would give the American shipowners net profits of \$8,500,000 even under the present 3 per cent immigration law.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Lasker was entirely too low in his estimates, and as the bill was indorsed by him and the President and as it passed the House it would involve a charge upon the Public Treasury of at least \$75,000,000 per year, or \$750,000,000 in 10 years, as has been fully shown in the minority report by Senator FLETCHER, by me, and others.

In keeping with his arrogant attitude, Chairman Lasker repeatedly refers to the fact that he and other representatives of the Shipping Board had testified at the hearings that the cost would be so-and-so, as if such assertions were conclusive and should not be questioned, when as a matter of fact such assertions were conclusively disproven upon the cross-examination of the same witnesses who asserted them, as well as by other facts.

Mr. Lasker begs the question by referring to amendments which were made in order to muster enough votes to jam the bill through the House or to report it out of the Commerce Committee. However, the amendment purporting to limit the voyage subsidies alone to \$30,000,000 per annum is wholly ineffective, as it is based upon the proposition that the Shipping Board "is satisfied that the amount payable in any fiscal year" \* \* \* "will not exceed the sum of \$30,000,000." Besides, if it is not intended that the payment of voyage subsidies shall exceed \$30,000,000 per annum, why is it so strenuously insisted that there shall annually be paid into this subsidy fund 10 per cent of customs duties, which it is estimated will amount to \$45,000,000 under the present tariff law, and also tonnage taxes of over \$4,000,000 per annum, aggregating \$49,000,000, not to speak of the provision for refunds from subsidy recipients making over 10 per cent profits, upon which Mr. Lasker lays much stress, but which, I will frankly state, I consider of no consequence.

In his letter to you Chairman Lasker states that "the statements as to the workings of the subsidy bill made in your circular are all taken from the minority House report prepared by Mr. DAVIS, Democrat, of Tennessee, a partisan report which everyone Washington-wise knows was prepared for political purposes and is unjustified by the facts." This characterization of the minority report is wholly and unqualifiedly false. Said report was originally filed June 28, 1922, and neither Mr. Lasker nor anybody else has answered or refuted a single statement contained therein. On June 13, last, I made a speech on this bill in the House in which I set forth the reasons for my opposition thereto, most of my speech being predicated upon testimony given by Chairman Lasker and other witnesses in behalf of the bill, and neither Mr. Lasker nor anybody else has as yet answered or refuted any portion of that speech.

I am opposed to this bill because I am opposed to subsidies in principle, but if I was in favor of subsidies I would be unalterably opposed to them being determined and dispensed by Albert D. Lasker; I would also be opposed to this bill because it is vicious and un-American in form, and because it involves an abdication by Congress and a usurpation of the rightful power of future Congresses. I am opposed to the bill because I am convinced that its passage and operation would be a hindrance, instead of a help, to a healthy, privately owned American merchant marine, although involving vast public expenditures. It is true that those of us who signed that minority report happen to be members of the minority party, members of the Democratic Party, which through its national platform has repeatedly declared against ship subsidies. However, the Republican Party in its national platform has never declared in favor of ship subsidies, even at times when efforts



were being made to put such bills through Congress. It is also true that 69 Republican Members of the House voted against this bill, and it is quite probable that at least that many more would have voted against the bill but for the pressure from the White House, or if the bill had been voted upon before the recent election.

Mr. Lasker purposely injected this charge of partisanship, because he knows that his infamous bill can not win upon its merits and that its only chance of passage through the Senate is as a partisan administration measure, as that was its only chance in the House.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Lasker endeavored to work both sides of the street in a partisan way. While he was busily engaged in trying to line up Republican Members of Congress, he assigned to the members of the Shipping Board who had been appointed as Democrats the duty of lining up the Democratic Members, and said members of the Shipping Board, pursuant to such plans, addressed letters to the Democratic members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Representative HARDY of Texas and I in a reply to such letter (both letters appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13, 1922), wrote in part:

"We readily concede that our merchant marine problem is of such transcendent importance that it should be solved upon merit and principle and not upon partisanship. However, with reference to the manner in which the matter has been handled, we wish to call your attention to certain facts of which you seem to be wholly oblivious. It is generally understood that Mr. Lasker was appointed chairman of the Shipping Board because of a very shrewd and valuable political service rendered during the last campaign; he certainly could not have been appointed because of any knowledge of shipping matters. His appointment, from a political standpoint, has been fully justified because he has demonstrated beyond question that he is a master politician. After months of laborious effort he has succeeded in committing the President to an elaborate and expensive ship subsidy program, a position never taken by a previous President. More than that, Mr. Lasker has enmeshed all the members of the Shipping Board in this program. This is especially significant in view of the fact that until now perhaps no high Government official in this country has openly and boldly advocated a ship subsidy since the emphatic rejection of such suggestions many years ago.

"Furthermore, Chairman Lasker, pursuant to the nonpartisan consideration for which you innocently vouch, invited the Republican members alone of the Merchant Marine Committee and the Commerce Committee to a dinner in his home, and after he had sumptuously fed them unfolded his ship subsidy program and undertook to commit them to it; and it has since been repeatedly announced in the press that Chairman Lasker has been in conference with the Republican members of said committees, that they had endorsed the ship-subsidy proposition in principle, and, later, that a bill had been agreed upon by Chairman Lasker, the President, and the Republican members of said committees. However, we predict that it will be demonstrated that Chairman Lasker misjudges some of the Republican members of said committees.

"Still further pursuing this nonpartisan course, a document of 268 pages, in which were assembled all the possible arguments in favor of ship-subsidy legislation, and particularly in favor of the bill which has since been introduced, was prepared and confidential copies thereof furnished to all the Republican members of the Merchant Marine Committee and Commerce Committee. It purported to have been prepared by the Bureau of Research of the United States Shipping Board at the instance of the latter. The undersigned, Mr. DAVIS, addressed a letter to the Shipping Board, requesting a copy of that document as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives, stating that as it had been prepared by Government officials at Government expense he presumed that he was entitled to a copy thereof. He received a reply from Chairman Lasker, in which he advised that those copies had been completely exhausted. He further stated that it had been 'prepared at the request of the President and for him, and was furnished to him and to such persons as he directed.' This statement in spite of the fact that copies of said document had been furnished to all the Republican members of the Merchant Marine Committee of the House and the Commerce Committee of the Senate, but to none of the Democratic members.

"Having, as he believes, successfully lined up the Republican members of said committees, Chairman Lasker has apparently assigned to you gentlemen the task of lining up the Democrats on said committees. However, you may tell Chairman Lasker that we are not as easily ensnared as some people he has come in contact with, and that we respectfully refuse to be 'bound and gagged' while he and the rest of you advocates of this iniquitous ship subsidy bill industriously disseminate your deceptive propaganda and lull the people and the Congress to sleep while you complete the job."

I take the liberty of addressing this letter to you in view of the fact that Chairman Lasker impersonated me in his letter to you, which he gave to the press and had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours very sincerely,

EWIN L. DAVIS.

#### NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the further consideration of House bill 13374, the naval appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13374) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1924, and for other purposes.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Bursum	Dial	Glass
Ball	Cameron	Dillingham	Hale
Bayard	Capper	Elkins	Harris
Borah	Caraway	Fernald	Harrison
Brandagee	Culberson	Fletcher	Heflin
Brookhart	Cummins	France	Hitchcock
Broussard	Curtis	Gerry	Johnson

Jones, N. Mex.	McCumber
Jones, Wash.	McKellar
Kellogg	McKinley
Kendrick	McNary
Keyes	Moses
King	Myers
Ladd	Nelson
La Follette	New
Lenroot	Nicholson
Lodge	Norbeck
McCormick	Norris

Oddie
Page
Pepper
Phipps
Pittman
Polindexter
Pomerene
Robinson
Sheppard
Shortridge
Smoot

Spencer
Stanfield
Stanley
Sterling
Sutherland
Townsend
Trammell
Warren
Watson
Weller

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I am very loath to take any time or to delay in any way one of the major appropriation bills; but the House has adopted at the close of the pending bill a provision requesting the President "to enter into negotiations with the Governments of Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan with the view of reaching an understanding or agreement relative to limiting the construction of all types and sizes of sub-surface and surface craft of 10,000 tons standard displacement or less, and of aircraft." The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has proposed an amendment extending that request so as to cover land armament, and also inserting an entirely new subject, requesting and authorizing the President to call a conference for the purpose of considering economic problems.

The provision of the House bill and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho open questions of such grave importance that I do not feel willing to allow them to pass wholly without comment. They propose to request the President and to authorize him to take certain action in entering into negotiations with foreign powers. Under our Constitution and our system of government the conduct of our relations with other nations is under the control of the President of the United States. The President must conduct all such negotiations, and he carries the great responsibility of our foreign relations. It could not be otherwise, either constitutionally or practically; for a legislative body is, to all intents and purposes, incapable of conducting negotiations.

There are several instances in our history where the President has consulted the Senate in regard to negotiations or as to entering upon negotiations, and there are other instances on the other side where the Senate has expressed to the President its opinion as to entering upon negotiations or as to their purpose and conduct. There can be no doubt of the right of the President so to consult the Senate or of the Senate so to advise the President; but, of course, the final power in regard to negotiations rests and must rest with the President. The President is not bound by any action or any advice we may offer in regard to negotiations any more than is the Senate bound, when a treaty comes within its jurisdiction, to accept the advice of the President. At the same time, almost any President would give great weight to the advice of the Senate, which shares with him the treaty-making power, in regard to negotiations. Therefore the advice we offer should be most carefully considered.

To inaugurate such a conference as is proposed by the Senator from Idaho is not at all like summoning a conference to consider the question of coal or unemployment or railroads; those are matters of vast importance to the people of the United States, but they are wholly domestic and are within our own control. When, however, we undertake to advise the President as to his duties as the representative of the United States in charge of our foreign relations, the matter assumes a much graver complexion. That is especially true when we advise the President to invite a conference of the powers. When the United States invites other nations to meet here in a conference it assumes a serious responsibility. We have the same right that every other power represented has to put our veto on any proposition which may be made, but it is not a little difficult for us to do so when we are in the attitude of a host. Therefore it is of the utmost importance when we urge the President to invite other powers to a conference that we make very explicit exactly what that conference is expected to do.

The first proposition suggested by the House provision and by the amendment of the Senator from Idaho relates to disarmament; that is, to extending limitations to surface, subsurface, and auxiliary craft of navies generally. It seems to me that it is well very briefly to call the attention of the Senate to just what has been done. It is now barely a year since the President, with the approbation of Congress and the general approbation of the country, called a conference here for the purpose of considering the question of disarmament, or I should say, to be more exact, the limitation of armament. It was not confined to the limitation of naval armament alone; it covered also land



armament, as does the proposed amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

Let me deal with the question of land armament first. It was the first subject dealt with by the conference. It was taken up at the third plenary session on the 21st of November, 1921; and, I think, we all must remember the speech then made by M. Briand, the prime minister of France at the time, on the question of the limitation of land armament. It was a speech of great force and great eloquence. He stated the position of France, and that they could not consent to any limitation of land armament in the present condition of affairs in Europe. That, of course, put an end to any further action by the conference on the question of land armament, for no action could be taken except by unanimous agreement. As a matter of fact, the United States had reduced its land armament to something less than a proper peace basis, and Great Britain had also reduced to a similar but sufficient basis her land armament; but the refusal of France, in which, as I recall, she had the sympathy of Japan, of course, put an end, as I have said, to any further consideration of the limitation of land armament.

France may have changed her attitude in that respect within the year, but if she has I have had no information to that effect. Of course, the Senator from Idaho may have information that France has altered her opinion; but, in any event, it would be useless to call a conference for the limitation of land armament without knowing as a preliminary step that France was ready to withdraw her objection and ready to consider with the other powers the limitation of her land forces. It would be futile to call a conference for the reduction of land armament unless it were known beforehand that those powers that were summoned were not going to object at the very beginning to any consideration of that point.

Now, as to surface and subsurface boats and the other auxiliary craft the limitation of which both the House and the Senator from Idaho desire to have a further conference to consider, when the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, opened the Washington conference, after stating in detail the proposition for the limitation of capital ships, he said:

The plan includes provision for the limitation of auxiliary combatant craft. This term embraces three classes; that is: (1) auxiliary surface combatant craft, such as cruisers (exclusive of battle cruisers), flotilla leaders, destroyers, and various surface types; (2) submarines; and (3) airplane carriers.

In the appendix which is printed with his address the plan is given in detail, and will be found on page 60 of the report of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament, under the head of "Auxiliary combatant craft," and it begins:

In treating this subject auxiliary combatant craft have been divided into three classes:

- (a) Auxiliary surface combatant craft.
- (b) Submarines.
- (c) Airplane carriers and aircraft.

Then follow propositions of limitation of the tonnage of such craft by the United States, Great Britain, and Japan; limitation of new construction, and scrapping of old construction; the limitation of submarines, of new construction, and the scrapping of old construction; the limitation of airplane carriers and aircraft, with the limitation of new construction and scrapping of old construction. Then come replacements, aircraft, and clauses relating to the merchant marine. In other words, the American delegation, the representatives of the United States, presented through Mr. Hughes to the conference a complete plan for the limitation of all the various kinds of auxiliary craft which are covered by the House provision and by the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

The matter was taken up in the committee of the conference charged with the question of naval disarmament, and was discussed at great length. I need not go into all the details of it. The French were opposed to the propositions as to capital ships, to which, however, they ultimately assented; but as to auxiliary craft, I read simply a passage from the telegraphic letter of M. Briand to Mr. Hughes on December 16, in which he says:

But so far as the defensive ships are concerned—light cruisers, torpedo boats, and submarines—it would be impossible for the French Government, without putting itself in contradiction with the vote of the chambers, to accept reductions corresponding to those which we accept for capital ships under this formal reserve, which you will certainly understand.

I have marked here the different statements that were made in the course of the debate, which it is not necessary to take the time of the Senate to read; but I can state the matter very briefly.

To take submarines first, Great Britain proposed that the conference should agree to the complete suppression of submarines—to their abolition. To that, I think, all the members of the conference objected, and it proceeded no further. The United States then made a proposition for the limitation of

submarines. We had at that time something over 80,000 tons, a larger submarine tonnage than any other power. We proposed to put on a limitation of 60,000 tons. France declined the limitation, and so, as I remember, did Japan, although after one declination no more was needed; but Holland, one of the smaller powers, also made strong objection to any limitation of submarine tonnage.

It is not necessary to go into the reasons of the different powers for this action; but the objection was an absolute one, and that made it impossible for the conference to effect any limitation of the submarines or the auxiliary craft except the general limitations put on as to the caliber of guns on vessels of less than 10,000 tons. That was a very important limitation, because it prevented competition in what is really the dominant element in a navy. Therefore no limitation was placed on auxiliary craft. The conference was unable to do it, owing to the refusal of France and other powers.

The naval treaty has been ratified by Great Britain, Japan, and the United States. It has not yet been ratified by France and Italy, the other two signers of the naval treaty. I hope and believe, and I have every reason to believe, that France will ratify the treaties of Washington within a very short time; but we have received no information, so far as I am aware, from France, from Holland, from Japan; or from Italy, that they are ready to meet us in conference and place limitations upon submarines and auxiliary craft. As in the case of land armament, it would be perfectly idle to take the great responsibility of calling a conference to consider limitations which were rejected only a year ago unless we had assurance from the powers invited that they were ready to consider the question of limitations for surface and subsurface and for auxiliary craft generally. It might not do any harm, except to put us in the rather absurd position of asking for a conference to consider limitations of armament which we knew beforehand would be refused, but it certainly could do no good. I have cordially supported, myself, the limitations which were made and we went as far as we could go, and I thought them a great step in advance; but it seems to me there is nothing to be gained until we are informed and until Congress is informed by those charged with our foreign relations that the time has come when we can have a conference which will be effective in further limitations applied to submarines and other auxiliary craft.

I know very well what the evidences of competition are to which the Senator from Idaho referred the other day. I know that the powers are building aircraft carriers and cruisers, as they have a right to do under the existing treaty of Washington. So far as the United States is concerned, we ought to build those light cruisers, and we ought above all to build the airplane carriers, whether a limitation is to be put upon them or not, because, though the Navy of the United States was very powerful in capital ships, in destroyers, in submarines, it was not well balanced. We had practically only one or two light cruisers. We had 10 authorized, vessels of 75,000 tons burden, and we need those light, unarmored cruisers very much. Some of them are under construction now. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] can tell the Senate just what their state of advancement is. They are absolutely needed. We ought to have them.

We have no airplane carriers. It is recognized, I think, by everyone, that the forces of the air will play a very great part in future naval warfare. Airplane carriers are necessary to accompany the fleet for the purpose, as their name implies, of carrying airplanes.

Without having looked into it with any minuteness, I think we are altogether too weak in regard to airplanes themselves; and although I most cordially supported the limitations of the treaties and believed, as I have said, that they constituted a very great step toward relieving the people from tax burdens and securing the peace of the world, I am not one of those who think that the time has come when we should have no navy or reduce it to a mere handful of ships.

It has been the characteristic of the American people, after they have had a war, to conclude that there never would be another. After the Civil War we proceeded practically to destroy our Navy, and in a comparatively few years we had no navy left. Then, at great expense, we went to work and slowly built it up. The performances of our new Navy in the Spanish War were such that the people generally were very ready to uphold it and we went on building a navy, with some stumblings and hesitations and not on a comprehensive plan; but still we went on building ships, and we all know what the history of our Navy was when the Great War broke upon us. I hope there never will be another war. I do not believe there is a man or a woman living who hates the thought of war more



keenly than I do; but the Navy and the Army are still necessary implements of national protection and defense.

No matter what treaties are made, we must have some means of protecting our commerce and our citizens abroad and our own territory and our citizens at home. I have had no sympathy with the extremes to which the House has gone. I was about to say not in the destruction of the Army but in reducing it to a point which is so low as to be positively perilous. It so happened that in 1919 the capital city of my State was for 24 hours left without a police force, which in its essence is a military force for the protection of a given locality. No one who is familiar with what then happened, I think, will ever recover from the lesson, which showed that it was not the body of men whom we see managing traffic, preserving order in the streets, arresting criminals, and so forth, but it was the fact of the existence of the force on which the safety of a great city depended. In those few unguarded hours there broke out from the darkness and from hidden places criminals and marauders. They suddenly appeared. Shops were broken into and sacked, lives were endangered and some lost, and the great city was at the mercy of those forces which are hidden from sight while we all live in the sunlight of well-protected streets and houses, and then in a flash people found the danger which was close to them. Among human beings there was an element which simply desired to rob, plunder, and destroy. Massachusetts was fortunate in her governor, who now presides over this Senate, and who, by his vigor, determination, and calmness, was able to face that crisis, and who happily was aided by a police commissioner who was a man of great courage, force, and readiness. The result of the governor's action was that the peril was over in 24 hours. The troops of the State were brought in, most of them men who had just come back from service in the Great War, and order reigned when those men appeared. But, Mr. President, those who saw and knew what happened in that one night realize the necessity of organized police or military protection if the fabric of society is to be at all maintained and anarchy and pillage are not to prevail.

What is true of the necessity of the maintenance of a police force in all our States and cities is equally true of this troubled world. No man can tell when some reckless, desperate power, perhaps a small one, may suddenly make an attack upon American citizens in foreign lands. In such emergencies it is necessary for every nation which undertakes to protect its citizens in every corner of the earth, as every great nation should, to have ships and troops, and not be obliged to wait for days and weeks, and perhaps months, before they can raise them. It is not a question of war making; it is a question of ordinary protection and safety, and under whatever arrangements we may make there is a limitation of reduction which ought always to be observed. It is not only not economy, it is the most reckless extravagance, to reduce the Army and the Navy of the United States to a point where we have no means of performing the duties which every great nation is obliged to perform.

I am not saying that, Mr. President, because I am opposed to a further limitation applied to auxiliary craft. I did my best personally only a year ago to secure those limitations. I should be glad to see them made now. But there is something that is not good like a limitation, something that is very dangerous, and that is when, without regard to national safety, we proceed in a false spirit of economy to enter on the road of abolishing or destroying our Army or our Navy.

I hope we can bring about a further limitation of auxiliary craft, just as I hope we shall keep our Navy, limited as it now is, at a point of high efficiency, and that we shall not allow it to go limping along without proper provisions for surface and subsurface craft and air defense. We have two great half-finished battleships, which were provided for in the treaty, which can be made into airplane carriers at once, and that ought to be done. We ought also to build up our airplane force.

Mr. President, I am aware I have strayed a little from the chief point I wanted to make, which is that desiring as I do to extend the limitations of a year ago, then confined to capital ships—I am putting aside for the moment the limitations which were put on gun calibers, which were equally important—I want to see those limitations extended to the auxiliary craft. I have told the Senate what the Senate and the House both should remember, that just about a year ago several of the powers assembled in Washington refused to agree to any limitations of the smaller craft, and until we can receive assurances that they are ready to proceed with those limitations and the limitation of land armaments, I confess I see nothing to be gained by our issuing an invitation which we know would either not be accepted or, if accepted, would be fruitless.

Mr. President, now I come to the very important proposition, not at all considered by the House, embodied in the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]; that is, a proposition for an economic conference. That, of course, is wholly new. In my judgment it is subject to the point of order; but I am not going to argue the point of order this morning. It no doubt will be made at the proper time. I am quite aware that the House in its clause put in general legislation in disregard of their rules, and when it came here it was in order because it came from the House, and I know very well the rulings made by Vice President Marshall in regard to the right which such action by the House conveyed to the Senate to amend general legislation and extend it if it was put in by the House. But this proposition for an economic conference is entirely new. It has no relation to the general legislation proposed by the House, and its importance is very great indeed.

Of course, we are all anxious to do everything we properly can do to restore business stability to Europe and to aid Europe in that direction in any reasonable way we can. Selfishness alone would be a sufficient reason for that, because the restoration of Europe to stability would tend to widen our markets and increase our commerce. Also, the American people feel a deep sympathy and also a very deep indignation against some of the cruel massacres perpetrated by the Turks which have disfigured Asia Minor and which have made the taking of Smyrna forever infamous. Everyone with any human sympathies at all must be anxious to have the United States do all it can to aid Europe in the situation which exists.

This amendment of the Senator from Idaho provides for "a conference which shall be charged with the duty of considering the economic problems now obtaining throughout the world with a view of arriving at such understandings or arrangements as may seem essential to the restoration of trade and to the establishment of sound financial and business conditions." That is very broadly drawn. It has no boundaries. It extends, or can be extended, from the heavens above to the earth beneath.

It seems to me, Mr. President, if we are to consider it at all with a view of action here—and it is very important action to express the opinion of the Senate on a matter involving our foreign relations—that we ought to know before we do it exactly what the powers of the conference are to be and just what the amendment means. As the amendment is worded, there is nothing to prevent such a conference, if called and assembled, from considering the question of the foreign debts due to the United States. It is true that consideration of those debts is now provided for by an act of Congress, but a treaty, if ratified, would override the act of Congress, just as an act of Congress could abrogate a clause in a treaty if made subsequently.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, would it interrupt the Senator if I asked a question?

Mr. LODGE. Not the slightest.

Mr. BORAH. I understood the Senator to say that if the treaty were agreed to, of course it would override the act of Congress.

Mr. LODGE. I meant ratified, of course.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator does not contend that the Congress itself may do anything toward canceling the debt until it is reported back to the Congress?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly not. The treaty would have to be ratified of course. But we summon the conference and we ought to tell the nations invited, if we do summon such a conference, exactly what we mean to object to and what we mean to consider. The fact of the invitation is a very serious matter. It is only just, when we are inviting a conference of this sort, that we should say just what we mean. I do not know what the feeling of Congress would be as to permitting a general economic conference to pass upon the foreign debts due to us, but it seems to me that is a question which should be excluded. I think the debts due to the United States should be considered and dealt with by the United States alone. I do not think there is any desire on the part of the people of the United States to deal with those debts otherwise than generously and fairly, but I do not think they would care to have the fate of those debts settled by other powers.

Under the conference of course we should be called upon to take part in the Reparation Commission. We are seeking no reparations, but we should be called upon to take part in it and enter to that extent at least into a revision, perhaps, of the treaty of Versailles. I think, whatever we feel about that, that we should determine and make clear in our legislation just what our opinion is and how far we should go. Such a conference, if it should ever come into existence, would undoubtedly have the power to consider advancing large sums of new money to help



Germany or to help France. I do not know how far the Senate thinks it should commit itself to the policy of advancing money from the Treasury of the United States for the reestablishment of the finances of Germany or France, but it seems to me that if we are to do it, if we are to enter into a conference where that question would surely arise, there ought to be some distinct statement as to our attitude in regard to it.

There are many other things involved. If we are to enter upon the business of restoring stability in Europe, of course we shall be called upon not only to help France, Italy, and Germany but the Austrian States of the former empire, the Balkans, Asia Minor, and, I suppose, Russia. I am not arguing now the merits of those varying propositions. I am merely suggesting that before we pass resolutions or adopt amendments favoring an economic conference we should know how far we are going and what we propose to do. It is easy enough to say "Let us have an economic conference," but when nations come together in an economic conference the case assumes immense importance and seriousness. There is one thing we should never permit, and that is to invite all the nations to meet us and have any misunderstanding about our attitude before we go into the conference. We must know exactly what we are ready to consider and what we will not consider.

Of course there are many other questions that might be brought up in the conference upon which I hope, before the debate ends and before final action is taken, the Senate will express its opinion. The question of immigration, for example, could not, in my opinion, be kept out of that conference under its very terms. I for one should not be willing to have that question go before the conference at all. I do not suppose that the conference would take up any purely political questions, but when anything is as large and broad as the conference proposed in this amendment no one can tell where it will end.

All I am asking to-day is that the Senate shall consider the matter with the utmost care before the amendment is agreed to. We are taking upon ourselves the duty of expressing the opinion of the United States Senate. We are undertaking to advise the President, who is charged with the conduct of our foreign relations, to take a very grave step. We do not know what he has done in these various directions. We do know that he is as desirous as anybody possibly can be to improve economic conditions in Europe and to aid those countries toward greater business stability. But what steps he may have taken we do not know. It will be no one's wish, I am sure, to embarrass him in the conversations or negotiations or the efforts which he may now be making, and which he is now making as a matter of fact. For that reason, as well as for the others I have mentioned, we ought to set forth very carefully exactly what we mean in the amendment if we are to accept it at all.

My own belief is as a general proposition that the United States can be of greater service to humanity and to its fellow nations in Europe and elsewhere by holding itself free from obligations which would bind it to action which it might not be willing to take when the hour for action came. The United States without treaty obligations of any kind rendered a very great service to the world. We asked nothing; we received nothing. We took not one inch of land nor have we sought a dollar of reparation. I am very proud to think that that is the record of my country.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator has just stated that if the amendment were to be adopted we should set forth with particularity what was to be included within the jurisdiction of the conference.

Mr. LODGE. Or what was to be excluded.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator to particularize and state what he thinks could be considered with propriety and what could not be thus considered?

Mr. LODGE. I have confined myself to stating the things that I thought should be excluded or should be certainly defined. What precisely we can do in an economic conference in directions we should be willing to accept I am not yet able to say. I think we can be of service as we have been of service, but what we can do precisely at an economic conference, unless possibly as an arbitrator or mediator, I am not able to define.

In conclusion may I repeat that we have taken no foot of land and no dollar of reparations, and I am very proud to think that is our record. I have not a word of reflection upon the other countries who suffered and sacrificed so much in the war, but they have already received large and important advantages from the conclusion of the war. I do not grudge them anything they have received. I do not question the justice of

it. But they have all received something of very great material value—immense territories in Africa, territories in Asia Minor, islands in the Pacific, and the rest. They have rid themselves for some years of the competition of the German merchant marine. Those things are all of great pecuniary value and, as I said, I do not grudge them anything. But we have asked nothing, we want nothing, we have taken nothing, and we do not propose to do so. I think that that fact alone should leave it to us to determine if we are to give, what we shall give, when we shall give, and where we shall give, and not permit it settled for us by other nations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I share the pride which the Senator from Massachusetts takes in the fact that we have not demanded nor have we obtained one inch of territory or one dollar of reparation or of indemnity from Germany, but I wish it to be remembered that that fact, redounding much to our praise, was a fact which originated in the mind and was carried out in the conduct of Woodrow Wilson, then President of these United States; and that whatever cruelty may have been visited upon him while he came very near dying in the line of duty, that praise at least must be given him, that, sitting around the council table at Versailles, the very first thing that he announced to the world was that America wanted nothing out of the war except winning the war and making the world safe for democracy so far as the war had done it, overcoming autocracy and overwhelming German junkerism. That was Woodrow Wilson before the time when, falling like a soldier in the line of battle, he fell heavily wounded; and he is heavily wounded yet; and I hope that nobody will attempt to take from him the praise of the initiative and the inauguration of that purely unselfish American policy.

Mr. President, after the World War was over a few things occurred and a few things are now occurring that do not meet with my approbation, although my approbation or disapprobation amounts to very little, for I am just about ready to leave this august scene and to take my refuge with the birds and my books and my grandchildren. There are, however, some things that I do not like. I do not like to see America standing idle to-day while the Turks are deporting Armenian grandfathers and grandchildren, killing men of military age wherever they can reach them, and ravishing Armenian women all the time. I have been ever a peace lover and opposed to war, but there are some things that do arouse my warlike instinct. If I were of this administration, instead of being merely an outgoing Senator, if I stood in Harding's place to-morrow, I would send instructions to Child and the others representing us at Lausanne to give the "unspeakable Turk" an ultimatum that no more Christians must be deported, no more Christians murdered, no more Christian women ravished in Asia Minor; and that if it were not possible to find a home for them somewhere in Asia, where they could be protected, a home should be found for them in eastern Thrace; and that these United States—God bless them—would stand with all their power and their resources and their ideals and their traditions behind the idea that unspeakable outrages perpetrated by the present Turkish Government shall cease, or, if they shall not cease, that then these resources and these ideals and these traditions shall come into the combat upon the side of humanity and upon the side of Christianity.

I hesitate a little to say "Christianity," because I know that in the bottom of your hearts most of you do not believe in it at all except in a perfunctory church way; but there is a Christianity which proceeds from the philosophy of Jesus, and that Christianity consists in making of ourselves our brother's keeper. I have no patience at all with the utterance of Cain and the utterance of so-called modern American progressives after Cain, when they say, "We are not our brother's keeper."

Mr. President, we are our brother's keeper, and if we were as selfish as a dog who loves nothing except his master, as men and women we are still and must still be by the very necessity of the situation our brother's keeper. To undertake to isolate these United States—48 of them, each one of them an empire in itself almost—from the common life and community ideals and the rich traditions of civilization and of Christianity is the maddest and the most selfish thing that anybody ever attempted to do since this world began.

Mr. President, there lives on S Street in this city now a man who is a private citizen. For a time he cut a wide swath in the history of the world; for a time he was worshiped by nearly everybody outside of his own country; and "A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country." Crippled in the war struggle, no pity shown for him here, no sympathy ever uttered on the other side of the Chamber that I remember, not even one word from anybody, and yet the Senator from Massachusetts this morning can point with pride to only one thing—and that was not the policy of the Senator from Massachusetts nor



the policy of this Chamber, on either side, but it was Woodrow Wilson's policy—that was that America should be represented in a great congress of the great nations of the world, and very nearly all the nations of the world, and should say, through her Chief Executive's lips, "We want nothing, not one inch of land, not a dollar of reparation nor indemnity; we are satisfied, provided only we can put an end to war and put an end to the causes of war, so far as that is possible."

He came back from there and brought the Versailles treaty with him. There were many things in it which I did not like; there are many things that the people did not like; but it contained the great central idea that was uttered by a British battalion when they were charging successfully a nest of German guns: "Never again! Never again! Never again!" They destroyed the German nest; they won a glorious victory; but the victory was not in destroying the German nest; it was in the utterance that those atrocious, contemptible, inhuman, uncivilized conditions of actual warfare in the air and on the earth and in the waters beneath the earth should never be revisited upon this world again if they could prevent it; and they uttered to God the words that they were dying that day to prevent it if they could. So far as I know, that was the only battalion that ever uttered that slogan of warfare out loud, but they were not the only battalion that carried that slogan of warfare in their hearts across the trenches and into no man's land.

Let me speak an almost parting word to you, for it will not be long before I leave you, and God knows I never intend to bother you after I leave you or to be bothered by you. [Laughter.] That almost parting word is this: America is a part of this earth; her traditions, her ideals, her magnificent unselfishness are a part of the present status of this earth; and I do not care what you say nor what you do nor how you vote, you can not get rid of that fact. We are not only a part of it but a magna pars; we are a great part of it; I might go further and say that we are the greatest part of it. Is there a man here listening to me to-day who imagines that the condition at Lausanne and in Asia Minor could have taken place or would have taken place if America or rather these United States—for we are only a part of America—had been members of the League of Nations with the will and with the power to make the league count? And yet, gentlemen every day seem to take pride in the fact that the league has not counted for much. It has counted for more than they say, but it has not counted to the full. Why? Because you took off its right arm; you left it fightless; you left it almost ambitionless; but if you think that the common sense and the common conscience of the common people of America have been stupefied and annihilated by what you did you are mistaken. Long after I have gone out of public life, perhaps after some of you have died an actual death, there will be the common sense and the common conscience of the common people of America behind the idea of preserving and enforcing—mark you, enforcing—the peace of the world, and behind that, too, enforcing industrial peace and other forms of peace on this earth.

Christ was not born for nothing and did not live for nothing and did not die for nothing and did not preach for nothing. When He announced the doctrine of the common fatherhood of God and the common brotherhood of man He meant what He said, and that idea sank into our hearts. I do not care how weak we are nor how sinful we are—and God knows I am one of the weakest and one of the most sinful—the idea is there, and no politics, no finesse, no private meetings of Senators or of Representatives can ever overwhelm it.

It stands like the church of God, secure against the gates of hell. You can not help it. You may delay the coming of the time. You may think you are awfully smart when you advise the American people to take care of their own interests and to let their brethren in Europe go to hell. You may think all that; but you are not awfully smart when you say it, and you are not awfully good when you say it. You are just common, selfish, mean men, and sometime you will be swept away like playing cards upon the surface of a bowl of water which has overflowed; and the overflow will mean that America once more will step into her own on the surface of this earth, and that we will allow no more Armenian women to be ravished, no more Armenian grandfathers and grandchildren to be deported, and we will not allow the unspeakable Turk a place in Europe at all. If we had been members of the league, there would have been no question of it. No matter if Great Britain and France for selfish reasons, commercial or otherwise, had been willing to compromise, American idealism would not have been willing to compromise.

Why, Mr. President, I was reading in the last Literary Digest, which perhaps most of you have read, an account of what was happening to the Greeks and to the Armenians. Some of the

things are unspeakable. Some of them are not to be mentioned before women, some of whom are in the gallery; and we—we, the people of the land of Washington and Jefferson and Henry Clay and Lincoln—are standing by, are holding our hands folded, and we are saying to the entire world, much to the encouragement of Germany and Russia and Turkey and Bulgaria, that we have nothing to do with it; that we are outside of the family; we rather doubt whether we are kin to the family or not. There may be a common fatherhood of God, but it does not cover them and us both. It covers them, maybe, or it covers us, maybe, but it can not cover us both. We can not live in the same tent; we do not intend to have anything to do with the same tent; and wise men in their imaginations, who think they are ultra progressive, tell us all that!

Do you know what real progressivism means? It means taking steps forward toward the concept of God and trying to idealize our ordinary relations toward a common goal, which is His will, and His will is for peace on earth amongst men. That is what real progressivism means; but I doubt not that to a lot of you it looks like conservatism and reaction of the most ultimate character—going back to God, which is rather, I imagine, a reactionary movement.

I indorse what the Senator from Massachusetts said in so far as I have dwelt upon what he said. It was a little peculiar, though, that he could say it, that even with his ingenuity he could say it, without mentioning the name of Woodrow Wilson, fallen soldier by the wayside. I got up merely to strain that point, and nothing else much.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not know that I disagree with the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as to the relationship which the Congress sustains to the President of the United States with reference to foreign affairs. I think the Congress may properly and constitutionally exercise much more power with reference to foreign affairs than it has assumed to exercise heretofore within the last few years. I understand, of course, that with the President lies, technically speaking, the act of negotiation; but we also have at all times not only the right but in my humble opinion the duty not only to consent but to advise. It certainly can not be out of place for the Congress—for the Senate particularly—to express itself with reference to a matter which not only appertains to foreign affairs, but which, by reason of its peculiar nature, essentially enters into our domestic affairs.

I do not think, however, that it is necessary to go into a technical discussion as to the powers of the President and the Senate, respectively, upon this subject, for it must be conceded that the amendment which I propose to offer is well within any number of precedents which might be cited.

The Senator calls attention to the fact that this amendment is very broad, and he is of the opinion that if we are going to pass a measure dealing with the subject we should be specific as to what we propose to do. If I may be permitted to say so, that would come closer to encroaching upon the power of the President as a negotiator than anything which has been suggested in the amendment. The amendment provides for the calling of an economic conference as well as a disarmament conference, and I think it will be conceded that until negotiations or satisfactory communications have been had with the foreign powers it would be very difficult to determine in detail the specific matters which would be dealt with under that kind of a call.

We passed a resolution with reference to a disarmament conference; and the President, as he had a perfect right to do, assumed to enlarge the program of the conference, and did so after communicating with the other nations. I take it that unless the President should advise us at this time as to the negotiations which are now going on and the extent to which they have progressed and the subject matters about which he is of the opinion that we may properly confer, it would be improper for us to undertake to designate specifically what particular subjects should be up for consideration at this conference.

I am perfectly willing—and I should suppose that the Senator from Massachusetts would be perfectly willing—to leave this matter where it properly belongs, and that is, with the Chief Executive, after he has communicated with the other powers as to the specific subjects which should be covered. The resolution was not drawn in this way inadvisedly or without due consideration. It was drawn for the very purpose of not embarrassing or curtailing, if he should see fit to observe our suggestion, the powers of the President to fix the program which he thought would be most effective in dealing with the subject. If, however, the Senator from Massachusetts or other Senators are sufficiently advised as to the Executive's views as to include those things which ought to be included, in their opinion, and to exclude those which ought to be excluded, I



should be pleased to consider the suggestions which they have to make.

This is not in all essentials a purely foreign question—that is to say, a question which relates alone to foreign affairs. It has progressed to the point where the subject matter of the conference affects our legislation here relative to domestic affairs, and it has progressed to the point where it concerns every business man and every farmer and every laboring man and practically every home in the United States. It is a matter about which we are compelled to think and with regard to which we must reflect in dealing with the multitude of things which we have to deal with and which are conceded to be peculiarly within the province of the Congress.

The Senator advises us that the President, as he knows, is now negotiating in regard to this matter. I am, of course, pleased to be advised of that in a way which would be considered as authoritative, but I had supposed that the President was thinking over the matter. I had no right to assume that he had yet taken up negotiations; but it is a matter which everyone must consider, and one with which we must all deal. It is interesting, however, to know that negotiations are now in progress dealing with the specific subject with which we are now concerned here as a Senate; and if we can be advised that the action of the United States Senate in approving of the dealing with these subjects will conflict with or embarrass the program which is now under way I shall be very glad indeed also to consider that in the disposition of the matter. I have a perfectly open mind as to how we shall deal with this subject matter. My mind is closed as to the proposition that we must deal with it. As to the method and the manner of treating the subject, it is one about which I should, of course, be glad to take suggestions in advance.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEW in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Did the Senator understand the Senator from Massachusetts to state that the President had been negotiating with reference to further disarmament or only as to the economic situation?

Mr. BORAH. I understood he referred only to the economic situation.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is what I supposed.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I had in mind, and it was to that I was addressing my attention at this time.

Mr. WATSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Senator hold that his amendment confers upon the President any power he does not now possess?

Mr. BORAH. I do not. The President has a perfect right to initiate these negotiations without this authority. It would be considered a part of his treaty-making power and also within his right as the Chief Executive. It has always been the contention of the executive department that the recent disarmament conference was initiated without any regard to the resolution which was passed by Congress. President Roosevelt initiated three separate movements for an international conference without any consideration previously by Congress. But there is very much to be gained, in my opinion, by a consideration of this matter at the hands of Congress and by the expression upon the part of Congress as to the necessity of the movement. The President could utterly disregard this amendment if he thought it was not wise to accept it, or he could, within the limits of the amendment, confine it to such subject matters as he thought were expedient to be dealt with. But if he is going forward, nothing could be more helpful than to be supported by the Congress.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does the Senator remember the provision of the deficiency appropriation act of 1913 prohibiting the President from calling any conference, or issuing invitations to foreign powers to hold a conference, except with the approval of Congress?

Mr. BORAH. I do not recall its terms and it has been very greatly respected.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] looked at that provision this morning and has it fresher in mind than I have, and if he has it before him I will ask him to read it, if the Senator from Idaho will allow it to be read.

Mr. BORAH. I shall be glad to have it read.

Mr. LENROOT. This is a provision in the deficiency appropriation act of 1913, Sixty-second Congress. It reads as follows:

Hereafter the Executive shall not extend or accept any invitation to participate in any international conference or like event without first having specific authority of law to do so.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I had not lately looked up that proposition, and I am glad it has been called to my attention. It makes all the more essential the adoption of this amendment, if the President is to deal with this matter effectively, and by the way of a conference. I doubt very much if that provision of the law would stand the test; but, assuming that it would stand the test, it is all the more necessary that the Congress of the United States approve of the program before the President acts. This would be true, however, that notwithstanding the fact that the President of the United States were authorized by this, he would not be compelled to regard the amendment if he thought it was unwise.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Just there I call the Senator's attention to the fact that his amendment not only authorizes the President to do it but it requests him to do it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, so did the disarmament resolution authorize and request him to call a conference, but it has been stated time and time again authoritatively that he did not call the disarmament conference as a result of that resolution. It originated in another way, we are told, and it was not the disarmament conference for which the resolution provided. It included subject matters which the resolution did not cover. It included countries which the resolution did not cover, and it included subject matters which even disarmament did not cover. Therefore I take it that it will not be argued here as a technical proposition that because we adopt this amendment the President will be compelled to adhere to the suggestion.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator if he does not think that if Congress shall adopt the amendment in the form in which he proposes it it will be an expression upon the part of Congress that there should be such an economic conference without limitation or condition?

Mr. BORAH. It would be an expression upon the part of Congress that there should be such a conference.

Mr. LENROOT. Without limitation or condition?

Mr. BORAH. No; not necessarily without limitation, because the power rests with the President to fix the limits.

Mr. LENROOT. The power rests in him, but when we ask the President to call an economic conference for a certain purpose there is no limitation or condition implied, it seems to me.

Mr. BORAH. Very well; I want the amendment to be so broad that the President of the United States will not be justified in saying, and could not sincerely say, that the amendment was such that he could not operate under it. If we undertook to say that it should be confined to reparations alone, the President would at once say, "In my opinion, it would be impossible to consider that subject without considering other matters in connection with it." If we confine it to this or that subject, and the negotiators, or those who are to be invited, suggest other subjects, the matter stops at once, so far as our negotiations are concerned, if we are confined to the amendment. If you give the President no breadth, no width, no discretion, you are in effect limiting his power to deal effectively with the subject.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. REED of Missouri. The Senator's view seems to be that the President should be left free to call up for consideration any question he sees fit to call up. Of course, any right the President can claim can be claimed by the representative of any foreign country the moment he takes his seat at this board. Is not that the Senator's view?

Mr. BORAH. That is correct.

Mr. REED of Missouri. So that when this conference is called, aided by the action of this body, we are calling a conference to consider any European question or Asiatic question or African question which may be brought before the conference.

Mr. BORAH. If the amendment is taken as it expresses itself, the conference would have to be confined to economic problems.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, yes; but the Senator agrees that they are not limited to that. The Senator is too fair and too broad a man to deny for a moment that it is easy enough to find that almost any conceivable question on earth is related in some way to the economic situation of the world and to the naval and military establishments of the world. So, if we call this conference, let us do it with our eyes open to the fact that there is no question on this earth which may not come up there for discussion, particularly unless we insist that the President in calling the conference shall expressly limit the



subject matter. Is not that about where we come out? I do not want to debate it; I want to get the Senator's view.

Mr. BORAH. I am very willing to debate it with the Senator or with anyone else, because if I am in error as to the terms of the amendment I shall be pleased to have suggestions in order that it may be made an effective amendment. You have either to take the amendment as a guide or you have to consider that the President is perfectly free to disregard it, of course. But you take it as a guide; then the conference must be confined in good faith to economic questions. I am perfectly aware of the proposition that they could consider anything which came before them for consideration. They could do it by disregarding the suggestions of the amendment; but nothing which they would consider could ultimately be binding until it was returned to the Congress of the United States for the action and approval of the Congress of the United States, or the Senate.

In that connection the Senator from Massachusetts referred to the question of our debts and said that the debts might come up for consideration before this body. Of course they might come up for consideration, but the negotiators could not cancel the debts or postpone the time in which they should be taken care of or change the interest or dispose of the subject until it came back to the Congress of the United States for its action. I take it there will be no conference called until negotiations have been had such as are supposed to be going on now as to the subject matters which will be dealt with, and if the President desires to confine the conference to economic questions, he will have it within his power to do so, and he will have the amendment backing him to that extent.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, the argument that nothing can be done which would bind us until it is written into a treaty and is ratified by the Senate is of course good. That is true of any kind of a conference we might call. The Senator is well aware of the fact that when you call a conference you intend to do something, and we never should enter upon a plan or scheme unless we have in advance determined that the thing to be done is wise.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there is no use debating that subject, because if it is unwise of course we do not want any action by Congress at all.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Exactly.

Mr. BORAH. But I have concluded long since that it is wise. Of course, as I have said, so far as I am concerned that is not open to debate, but the method of dealing with it is.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I am glad to get the Senator's position on that. He has concluded it is wise, and therefore we ought to do it, in his judgment.

Mr. BORAH. In my judgment; but I am only one of 96.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Nobody has more respect for the Senator's opinion than I have, but for those who may not have made up their minds that it is wise to go through with this program it is no answer to their objection to say that we may do something unwise but that we can afterwards refuse to ratify it. I have heard that argument advanced before, as has the Senator, "Let us go ahead; we do not have to ratify." But we all know the tremendous force of a tentative arrangement that is made between the representatives of governments, and we all know how embarrassing it would be to our own country to initiate this program and then at the end say, "Oh, well, you did something which did not suit us, and while our representatives agreed to it the Congress will disagree to it." We have heard that argument before.

Mr. BORAH. We had a very good illustration of it in connection with the Versailles treaty.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Exactly; and I do not want to see it repeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Missouri, they are agreed upon the idea that if we enter into any conference at all with the other nations of the earth, we must enter into it with a fixed idea which we must not change while we carry on the conference.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Oh, no.

Mr. BORAH. I do not take that position.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Nobody else does.

Mr. BORAH. I do not take it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Senator from Missouri to say that we could only enter into a conference to accomplish some purpose which we outlined, and I understood the Senator from Idaho partially to agree with that. I merely rose to say—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator did not understand me. That is all I desire to say.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well, then.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senators have a misunderstanding between themselves, I would like to proceed until they come to an agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon me further, I merely wanted to say that if we enter into a conference with other nations with fixed ideas, from which we must not vary, that is not a conference at all; it is a meeting called by us, with a chairman, a secretary, and a treasurer appointed beforehand and a plan outlined. Of course, if we enter into a conference with other nations we must confer with them as well as they with us, and we must reach some conclusion that was not the fixed purpose of every nation.

Mr. REED of Missouri. That is what I said.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And it must be the finally compromised opinion of all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. A bill (H. R. 12817) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, while I always hesitate to object to interruptions, I would like to proceed for a short time with the expression of my views in regard to the necessity of the amendment.

I look upon the question of dealing with these economic problems as distinctly at this time an American question, not exclusively so but inclusively so. It has reached the point where we are just as deeply concerned and ultimately to be quite as much affected by the situation as any European power. It can no longer be said that in dealing with these matters we are dealing with exclusively European questions. It is quite as much and in some respects quite as seriously an American question as the question of the war was in the spring of 1917. The conflict had proceeded in Europe for over two years and it was not regarded previous to that time as a question affecting American interests sufficiently to justify the United States taking part in the war. The invasion of Belgium had taken place. The outrage of Louvain and many of the things which were regarded as the most atrocious acts of the war happened between 1914 and 1917. But there came a time when the question reached the United States, when the subject had to be dealt with by the American people. If we are to believe the reports which come to us from every quarter not only in Europe but in the United States the economic problems have now reached the point where they are of practical concern to the people of the United States. It is now an American problem. We are suffering and suffering greatly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield for a question, and then I wish the Senator would permit me to proceed for a time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall permit the Senator to proceed now, if that is his wish.

Mr. BORAH. No; the Senator is on his feet and I yield for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall not interrupt the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. BORAH. For illustration, we are now considering the naval appropriation bill. A little over a year ago we held a disarmament conference. The naval appropriation this year is \$1,250,000 more than it was last year. We are advised by a report of the House committee that unless disarmament is extended to certain other subjects we shall again in a short time be in the midst of a naval race. In other words, we are now confronting a situation where we are to lose any possible advantage which was secured by reason of the disarmament conference a year ago, and in addition to that are undoubtedly to take upon ourselves a tremendous burden in the way of a renewed or a new naval constructive competitive program.

In addition to that, every spokesman of the administration, having regard now for the representatives in the Cabinet, is advising the American people that we must increase our Navy and enlarge our Army far beyond anything that we now have in mind. We are told by representatives of the Navy and by representatives of the Army that that condition is necessary by reason of conditions which obtain in Europe; that owing to the disturbances and discontent and unsettled conditions with reference to economic questions, and particularly reparations questions, the situation in Europe is so perilous that the United States can do no other than to prepare for another possible



conflict. It is not, therefore, purely a question for the Executive. It is not purely or solely a European question. It is also an American question and it is essentially and indispensably so.

I think it is pretty generally conceded that if another year shall transpire with reference to reparations such as the last year has been, and another year of conditions such as have prevailed in Europe shall be covered by the coming 12 months, war is imminent upon the continent of Europe, not between small nations or insignificant nations, but between the great powers of Europe.

I venture to say, after witnessing what happened in the campaign of 1916, and what happened immediately after the campaign of 1916, that if any conflict arises in Europe within the next year it will be practically impossible for us to remain out of the conflict. It is the height of prudence, therefore, and the first call of patriotism for the American people's authorized representatives to undertake to ameliorate the situation or to adjust the situation so as to eliminate the sources of discontent and the sources of turmoil in Europe.

The conditions which there confront us are peculiarly and particularly economic in their nature. The entire subject is organized around the question of reparations. To-day in every one of the leading countries whose budget I have been permitted to examine there is an increase in the military budget, and the justification of it is upon the ground of the unsettled conditions relative to reparations and the consequences which may follow.

So we are facing another continental disturbance. We are facing it by reason of the fact that there is a question of the settlement of the amount of reparations and a question of the adjustment of the controlling economic problems between Germany and France. If it were purely a European question or a European problem, if it had not reached us, if it were not here every day in our lives, affecting our standard of living and our taxes and affecting our appropriations and everything else with which we have to do, it might well be contended that it was premature to undertake to deal with it. But it is upon us. It enters into all our affairs. It influences our legislation. It has its effect upon our appropriations and it weighs with great heaviness upon all our people.

The conditions in Europe have been referred to of late by some whose position to judge is such that we are not permitted to disregard their suggestions. I read a statement from the American ambassador at St. James, a single line from an extended interview, in which he said:

The meeting of allied premiers in London is the most important conference that has been held since 1918. If they are unable to find a solution, I do not know what is going to save the continent of Europe from utter wreckage.

Well, before the wreckage takes place in its ultimate effect there will be something more than an economic disturbance. Before the matter has reached the point where we may consider it as a financial or industrial breakdown there will be other conditions attach to it from which we will have difficulty in divorcing ourselves as they proceed.

I have also the statement of a leading French publicist, who supports in even a more pronounced way the view just read from the American ambassador, that without a settlement or an adjustment of these conditions Europe is facing another world conflict. I might spend the afternoon in reading that which is familiar to all Senators, that it is now recognized that we have reached a crisis in the economic affairs in Europe which extends to and includes the economic conditions and affairs also of the United States, and the question is whether or not we are going to undertake to deal with it now or whether we shall disregard it until such time as it forces us to take action probably in a different way.

This condition of affairs going on for the last two or three years has drawn us further and further into Europe. We are further into the affairs of Europe now than we were upon the 4th day of March, 1921. We are now concerning ourselves with more of the affairs of Europe, necessarily I shall assume, than we were a year and a half or two years ago. We are being drawn further and further into the affairs of Europe by reason of the economic problems with which Europe is now contending. We ratified what is known as the German treaty. Without debating now the wisdom or the unwisdom of doing it, the result of the ratification was to claim upon our part all the rights under the Versailles treaty which had been accredited or granted to the United States by its terms, and now, to all practical effects so far as our moral influence is concerned and, in my opinion, so far as the technical influence is concerned, we are assisting in the administering of the Versailles treaty.

We are sitting upon the reparations commission, not officially it is said, but in Europe they do not discern the difference so

far as the results of the acts of the commission are concerned. Mr. Boyden, at the head of our commission there, takes part in the discussion of every question which comes up. He not only offers his views but he offers his argument and insists upon this or that being the correct course. Does anyone undertake to say that with a representative of the United States sitting upon the commission, with the moral backing and influence of the United States, urging a certain course or suggesting it, that it is without influence in affecting the course which the commission takes? It is in practical effect the administration of the Versailles treaty by this commission, in which we are not merely an observer looking on to report back to the President of the United States as to what takes place. We are far more than a reporter at that conference. We are a participant in the conference. It may be thought wise, especially for home effect, to avoid some technical proceedings but the ultimate results are the same.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, with regard to Mr. Boyden's part in the conference, I took occasion to ask the Secretary of State on yesterday, and he told me that Mr. Boyden never voted; that he took no part in the conference unless he was asked for his opinion; that he was acting entirely unofficially and that was perfectly understood by every power.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it may be that technically Mr. Boyden does not vote, but the Secretary of State is misinformed if he thinks that Mr. Boyden waits for somebody to ask him for his opinion before he expresses it. I have talked with gentlemen who have sat upon subdivisions of the commission and they advise me to the contrary; that, so far as they were individually concerned, they took precisely the same part upon the subdivisions of the commission as did anybody else.

Mr. LODGE. I can only state the information which I have received from the Secretary of State.

Mr. BORAH. I think that technically, perhaps, Mr. Boyden does not vote, and not once in ten times do they ever come to a final conclusion by reason of a vote.

Mr. President, there is very little there for Mr. Boyden to observe if he is simply an observer; but there is a vast amount for him to do if he is there as a participant; and he is there all the time.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, of course if Mr. Boyden is doing what the Senator from Idaho suggests, he must be acting contrary to his instructions, which I think is very unlikely.

Mr. BORAH. I am not going to discuss that, but I have my opinion about it. I do not doubt the technical instructions but I have no doubt as to effect of what he is doing.

Mr. LODGE. Of course I have not been present at those meetings, but I implicitly believe what the Secretary of State says about his understanding of the matter.

Mr. BORAH. I am not questioning the veracity of the Secretary of State, but I know that Mr. Boyden is not sitting there merely as an observer and doing nothing but to take note of what happens and to report it back to the United States. He goes much further. I am advised that there is no more influential man in the body in bringing about results than is Mr. Boyden.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, I do not know the sources of the information of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I think that it is inevitable. The Senator will remember that under the German treaty we reserved the right, in case we elected to do so, to have membership on the Reparation Commission, and I think we have elected to do so for all practical purposes; we are there.

Mr. LODGE. That is not the view of the Secretary of State; I can say that certainly.

Mr. BORAH. I defer to his view, for he is a great lawyer, and as a lone technical proposition he could sustain his position.

Mr. LODGE. I also know Mr. Boyden. He comes from Boston, and is a man of very high character and great ability. When the Secretary of State says Mr. Boyden holds no official position, that he is recognized as being unofficial, and that he speaks only when called upon, I rather think the Secretary of State so understands the situation, unless he is grossly misinformed.

Mr. BORAH. I am not questioning what the Secretary of State understands, but does the Senator from Massachusetts contend that in paying for the Reparation Commission the German Government does not pay our commissioner also?

Mr. LODGE. I do not know anything about the payments to commissioners.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.



Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from Idaho stated that he thought we had elected to take our place upon the Reparation Commission. Is it not a fact that that election was reserved to Congress, and no power was reposed in the Executive to make such election?

Mr. LODGE. That is reserved in the treaty, of course. The President can not send a representative without our confirmation.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator from Wisconsin turn to the German treaty?

Mr. LENROOT. I have it not before me, and I have made the statement merely from my recollection of the language. I will be glad to correct my statement if it is ascertained that I am wrong about it.

Mr. BORAH. I thought I had a copy of the treaty here, but I have not. It may be that that power was reserved to Congress. I know that at the time it was contended that only Congress should authorize such representation, but that was not the view of all the Senate. It may be that we put a reservation onto the treaty in reference to that matter; I think perhaps we did; but that does not change the situation a particle as to what is practically taking place with reference to the activities of the Reparation Commission.

However, Mr. President, suppose that we admit that technically Mr. Boyden is not an official member of the Reparation Commission, which I am perfectly willing to do; suppose we admit that technically he does not vote; no one who has been in attendance there pretends to say that he is not constantly engaged in the administration of the affairs which come up for the decision of the Reparation Commission. He is not there merely as an observer to report information, but he is participating and taking part in the discussions and proceedings.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator from Idaho, of course, does not contend that Mr. Boyden could make any sort of an agreement that would be binding upon the United States?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, he could not make an agreement which would technically be binding upon the United States, but they are operating under a treaty and when a decision is made the function of the commission ends.

Mr. WATSON. No.

Mr. BORAH. But we are now discussing what is actually taking place there so far as our activities in Europe are concerned with reference to existing conditions. Mr. Boyden is advising in regard to them just the same as a conference here would advise in regard to them.

Mr. WATSON. If the gentleman from the United States sitting there unofficially has such weight that his advice is of controlling influence, then of necessity we would be more or less bound by what he says, would we not?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; we might be morally bound under certain conditions.

Mr. WATSON. By the same process of reasoning, if we call a conference and appoint a conferee to that conference and that conferee, for instance, agrees there that the foreign debt which is owing to us shall be forgiven, then would we not be morally bound by that agreement?

Mr. BORAH. I do not think so, because that is a mere matter of negotiation.

Mr. WATSON. Ah; but we call the conference. The work of the Reparation Commission is a matter of negotiation.

Mr. BORAH. No; the work of the Reparation Commission is not one of negotiation. It is in the nature of the administration of government.

Mr. WATSON. Largely it is a matter of negotiation as between the commissioners. They are there to negotiate.

Mr. BORAH. No; they are not negotiating. They are administering a form of government. The Reparation Commission is a form of government, in the heart of Europe, with governmental powers, and is exercising governmental powers, both legislative and quasi judicial.

Mr. WATSON. That is partially true; but, aside from that, coming back to the other question, let me ask my friend from Idaho if, under the sweeping terms of the Senator's amendment and without limitation, we appoint a member of the proposed conference to represent us at the conference and at that conference he should agree that the debts that are owed us by foreign countries should be forgiven, would we not then be morally bound to stand by that agreement?

Mr. BORAH. Let me ask the Senator this question, and then perhaps we can come to a conclusion: Suppose the President of the United States, through the Secretary of State and his foreign ambassadors, with the aid of the international bankers, should come to a conclusion that we should cancel the

foreign debts and should agree to that, would we not be morally bound?

Mr. WATSON. I am inclined to think that we would be.

Mr. BORAH. Then, let us have it in the open.

Mr. WATSON. We are going to have it in the open. It can not be done secretly; but the Senator is not willing, I understand, to include that limitation in his amendment.

Mr. BORAH. I have not said that. There has been no amendment offered. Whenever it shall be offered I will be perfectly willing to consider it.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, in view of the legislation passed creating the debt commission, does the Senator think that we would be morally bound if the President should make any arrangement for the cancellation of the debt?

Mr. BORAH. I think under certain conditions we might be morally bound.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not; but I wish to say to the Senator I have before me the reservation to which reference was made a few moments ago, and it expressly reserves the right of representation through the action of Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Then if the President could not bind us in a moral way by reason of his negotiations, he being the Executive, I do not think that the conference would morally bind us either.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not think the Senator believes that President Wilson morally bound the Congress when he negotiated the treaty of Versailles.

Mr. WATSON. Of course, morally bound is one proposition and legally bound is another; but if the President through his agents were to agree upon a cancellation of the debt we would not be bound to any greater degree than where the President has negotiated a treaty and sent it up to us. We reject treaties regardless of the sense of moral obligation, if any there be.

Mr. BORAH. But there could not be any higher moral obligation come from the proposed conference than comes from the duly authorized power of the Government to negotiate a treaty.

Mr. WATSON. Which is my contention. I thought the Senator was contending otherwise, as he contended frequently in his arguments against the League of Nations, that whenever we appointed a representative to sit in the council or in the assembly, regardless of his power, and that representative entered into an agreement, we were morally bound, and from that moral obligation there would be no escape.

Mr. BORAH. We are digressing now from the matter which is of concern to me, and that is what we are actually doing in Europe at the present time. Whether technically, morally, legally, or accidentally, the question is we are drifting further and further into Europe.

Now, let me call attention to another proposition. We have an army on the Rhine in Europe. What is its business there? It is four years now since the war closed.

Mr. REED of Missouri. How much of an army have we there?

Mr. BORAH. All they want. We have all that is deemed essential.

Mr. REED of Missouri. About 800 men; is not that the number?

Mr. WATSON. About 1,000 men.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I secured a statement from the Secretary of War just a day or two ago with reference to that question, and he stated that there are in Europe just a little over 1,000 men and, I think, 118 officers.

Mr. BORAH. What are 1,000 men doing there? Why is an American army there? Why is the American flag there? Why is the Government of the United States in the representation of its flag and its Army there? We must be there for some purpose; we must be there to effect a result, and it is supposed that 1,000 men are sufficient to effect that result. I assume if 10,000 were necessary to accomplish the same result they would be there. The fact is, Mr. President, by our presence there we are doing precisely what France asked us to do, or, rather, what was proposed in the treaty, namely, that we should guarantee the territorial integrity of France against the unprovoked aggression of Germany.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I will yield in a moment. So long as our soldiers are guarding the bridgeheads over the Rhine we are effecting the same result precisely that France anticipated would result from a signing of the treaty; we are giving notice to Germany and to the other nations of the world that our influence, our sympathy, our flag, and our Government are upon the side of France in the aggressions of Germany, and if the treaty between France and Great Britain and the United States



with reference to the boundary between Germany and France had been ratified it would not be anything different from what we are doing now. We are assisting in guarding and protecting the frontier of France. What other purpose would the treaty serve? If our soldiers must take the place of the treaty indefinitely, then I prefer the treaty.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Does the Senator think and has he not thought for a long time that the American troops in Germany ought to be brought home?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. REED of Missouri. So do I.

Mr. BORAH. And one reason why we should want to settle the economic problems is to bring the troops home and to get out of Europe. I feel they will be there so long as this fearful condition continues.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Would it not be easier to bring the troops home than it would be to have the proposed conference?

Mr. BORAH. You can not bring them home, nor can I.

Mr. REED of Missouri. We could make the President do it.

Mr. BORAH. We could not make the President do it. He is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and if in the discharge of his duty he wants to assign them there, I do not know of any power that we can exert to compel him to bring them home. We may refuse to create an Army, but when it is created he is the commander.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I wish to change my statement. We can not make him bring them home, because none of us want to make the President do anything, but I think if there were a resolution passed asking the President to bring the troops home, where they belong, the President would recognize that request from Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, during the campaign of 1920 the President of the United States stated to the public that the troops had no business in Europe and that they would be brought home. This matter was debated in the Senate of the United States, and afterwards the Secretary of War stated that the troops were being brought home, and that they would all be home just as soon as we could get ships enough to carry them. The representative of France in this country—the French ambassador—made his protest to the Secretary of War, according to the press, and the President of the United States, and they kept them in Europe. Why were they kept there? We are just as much involved in that situation as if we had signed the treaty, and they are being kept there for the same identical purpose.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, those troops, of course, as the Senator knows, are not there under the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. I may concede they are not.

Mr. LODGE. They are there under the armistice.

Mr. BORAH. I am perfectly aware that such is the contention. We did not ratify the Versailles treaty; but when we failed to ratify the treaty we apparently substituted the troops to keep the guard instead of the treaty.

Mr. LODGE. We kept them under the armistice.

Mr. BORAH. Let us admit it; but why are we keeping them there? What are they there for?

Mr. LODGE. That I can not tell the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. No; and no living man can tell for the reasons would admit the whole contention.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, did not the armistice end when our separate treaty with Germany was ratified?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; precisely so. I thank the Senator.

Now, the fact is, Mr. President, that we are dealing with this situation in what I think is a roundabout way. Here is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who is in as close touch with the Secretary of State as any other man in the Senate, and perhaps more so. We find our troops upon the Rhine, and he notifies us that he does not know why they are there. I know why they are there. They are there because it is not thought wise, it is not thought safe, to bring them out so long as Europe is in her present condition; and I venture to believe that if you will ask the Secretary of State why they are there, or the Secretary of War, and they feel free to speak fully, they will tell you that the French ambassador notified them that under present conditions in Europe, the question of the reparations and the unsettled conditions which prevailed, it was necessary to have the troops there as a part of the moral force to keep the peace. That will be the reason in substance and effect.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. Let me ask another thing. Suppose that upon to-morrow morning the German troops should attack the forces on the Rhine. Suppose that M. Clem-

enceau's fears should prove to be well founded, and they have been manufacturing arms and munitions, and that they have hundreds of thousands of men ready at any time to take to arms. Suppose they should do so, and should undertake to take the Rhine. Our soldiers would be in the front of the fight and the United States would be in the midst of a European war.

I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I know this much about keeping the troops there: One reason, I know, is that they are there at the earnest request of Germany.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator know that?

Mr. LODGE. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, you can find all the German authority you want that they would be delighted to have us send the troops home. There may be a division of opinion in Germany about that. There may be some who desire them there. If so, it is for the same reason that we are keeping them there, and that is because of the unsettled conditions in Europe. Certainly Germany would not want our troops there, costing her as they are, unless she thought that the unsettled and discontented conditions in Europe made it essential for them to be there.

Mr. LODGE. If our troops were moved from the bridgehead at Coblenz, the Senator knows perfectly well that their places would be taken by French troops.

Mr. BORAH. Very well. I am talking about America being in Europe, not about France being in Europe. That is where France ought to be.

Mr. LODGE. I said nothing about France being in Europe. My information is not extensive, but I know that France is in Europe.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and there are some who think this country ought to be.

Mr. LODGE. And they will not get rid of troops at Coblenz by removing the American troops. I think they ought to be brought home, as a personal matter of opinion.

Mr. BORAH. Yes. Well, everybody thinks they ought to be brought home, and nobody will vote to bring them home.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me, in spite of his late refusal to be interrupted?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. When the question was raised a year ago about bringing home those troops it was opposed without much ceremony.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator pardon an interruption?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; it seems that I must be courteous to all.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He and the Senator from Massachusetts both seem to be agreed that our troops on the Rhine ought to be brought home; and the Senator has just said that everybody says that, but nobody wants to do it. I want to call his attention to the fact that I have never said it and I do not think they ought to be brought home. I think the American flag ought to be there; and when the Senator says that they are there for the purpose of making Germany observe the terms of the treaty of peace I admit that, and I think they ought to be there for that express purpose.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and so do the people who are keeping them there think they ought to be there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Because, outside of the treaty of peace, we were parties to the armistice. Whether we went into the treaty of peace or not, we were parties to the armistice; and a part of the armistice terms was that we were to occupy the gateways to the Rhine until Germany conformed to the treaty of peace which was to be afterwards entered into.

Mr. BORAH. It is now four years since we closed the war. The troops are still there. That is a physical fact. You can explain and excuse and refine upon the reasons, but there they are four years after the war, and two years after the promise was made to bring them home. It must be a powerful and controlling reason. I do not know what specific reason would be assigned if it were deemed necessary to assign a reason, but I venture the opinion that the real reason is because of the unsettled conditions in Europe, particularly over the question of reparations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. They would not be there unless they were taken for some such purpose as the Senator from Mississippi suggests; and they will not be brought home, in my humble opinion—that is to say, our presence on the Rhine will be maintained—until peace is restored, until the present conditions are settled, until the turmoil which is now seething shall have an end.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Until Germany conforms to the terms of the armistice, which hitherto she has not done.



Mr. BORAH. Very well. Then, if that is to be the time, and the treaty is to remain unchanged, there is no child now living who will see the time when our troops will return.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, while this subject is up I should like to ask the Senator if he will accept the amendment which I am going to send to the desk?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I certainly do not want to yield here for the purpose of offering amendments and accepting amendments.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator will wait until I get through, I will discuss the amendment with him.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Will the Senator allow me to send it to the desk to be printed without being read?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; and the Senator may have it read if he wishes.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Let it be read, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The READING CLERK. It is proposed to amend by adding at the end of the Borah amendment the following:

The President is requested to at once cause the return to the United States of all American troops now stationed in Germany.

Mr. BORAH. In so far as I am able to do so, I would favor the amendment. But I think it stands upon its own merits. That will accomplish one thing which I want to accomplish by adjusting the conditions in Europe. That is one step toward getting out of Europe.

Mr. President, we will not adopt that resolution and that amendment, in my opinion, but in all probability those troops will remain there indefinitely. There is no probability now of their being brought home, and it is by reason of the conditions which now prevail in Europe.

It may not be out of place here to call attention to the situation with reference to these troops, both of France and of the United States, upon the Rhine. I have a communication to the Baltimore Sun by Mr. Bouton, the European correspondent, in which it is said—he claims to speak, so far as he gives data or figures, from the record—

The debt owed to the Allies by Germany \* \* \* is being increased daily by more than 4,000,000 gold marks of absolutely unproductive expenses. The further absolutely unproductive occupation of tillable land for military purposes is adding even more millions to this sum yearly.

But the unproductive wastage along the Rhine goes on unchecked. The average linotype probably does not contain enough ciphers to give in paper marks the amount required of Germany yearly to support the armies of occupation. But it can be given in another way. Let the reader set down 3,200 and then add nine ciphers to that sum. It is a good deal of money, even in paper marks. It would be a good deal in cowrie shells or wampum. And it amounts to almost eight times the total domestic budget of Germany. For unproductive purposes!

In other words, there is being maintained upon the Rhine at this time an army which in expense to Germany amounts to almost eight times her domestic budget; and the one great problem which is now tormenting the world is how Germany shall be able to meet the reparations judgment, whatever it may finally come to be. Under the present program and under the present policy which is being pursued the time will never come when Germany can meet this situation, and so it is postponed indefinitely; and unless there is some understanding or some conference or some arrangement or some agreement by which a changed condition can be brought about Germany will not be able to meet the demands which are now placed upon her and we will be drawn deeper and deeper and deeper into Europe from year to year, in my opinion. It is not, my friends, for the purpose of getting into Europe, it is for the purpose of getting out of Europe, that I believe it is absolutely necessary to exert whatever influence we can as an independent power to deal with the situation which is now keeping us there and drawing us deeper and deeper into her affairs each year.

Take the Lausanne conference: True, we were there unofficially! That is the saving grace; but, unofficially, what are we doing? In two particular instances we are informed by the Associated Press that our unofficial representative was the deciding factor in bringing about certain situations. Could he have accomplished any more had he been official? Would we have been bound by his acts as a Nation, morally speaking, in any different way, had he sat there officially? Even if he had sat there officially, he could not have bound us to any greater extent, in my judgment, unless he reported back a treaty which we ratified. So, as a practical proposition, there is no subject that comes up in Europe that we are not undertaking to deal with, and exerting our influence and exerting ineffectively and therefore unwisely. Whatever the conference may be, or whatever it may be called, we are there speaking for the United

States in some form. Whether we cast a vote or not, we are exerting our influence to bring about a certain policy or a certain condition; and Europe looks upon it, and is coming to look upon it, as something more than mere observing and reporting back.

Mr. President, I want to call attention to some of the conditions in this country which result by reason of the unsettled affairs in Europe. I call attention to these conditions because they seem to me to justify our consideration of this subject matter even if there were no other reasons. I do not believe for a moment that the President of the United States can be unconcerned as to the conditions in this country or as to why those conditions exist. Therefore I do not believe that the President can be idle or inactive with reference to bringing about a change in the situation. We are informed by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that he is active in the matter.

As I said in the beginning, if this amendment will embarrass the President, if it will in any way disconcert the Chief Executive, if it will embarrass instead of help, that is the most conclusive argument which could be presented against it, in my judgment. If, on the other hand, it is looked upon as a problem which not only requires the technical skill and the negotiating power of the Secretary of State and of the President, but should have the moral support and the public opinion of the United States behind it, and the treaty-making power behind it, then there is every reason why this amendment should be adopted.

When I see Europe sinking lower into misery and suffering, and when I know that our own people are suffering by reason of that, and when I know that countless millions of Europe are this winter to suffer and thousands of them die, I am not willing to sit without at least expressing my conviction that something ought to be done, if it is possible to do it, and I can not conceive that it is embarrassing the President of the United States in the slightest for the whole world to know that the Senate of the United States would like to see him negotiate for an adjustment of these conditions.

Has the Senate of the United States become so inconsequential, has it become so utterly without power or respect among the nations of the earth and with our own people, that it should either be indifferent to such a situation or, if not indifferent, that it should keep its views to itself for fear of disturbing some fanciful situation not disclosed?

Let us look at the situation in this country for a moment. Our markets in Europe are indispensable to the prosperity of the American producer. We sell from 23 to 25 per cent of our wheat abroad. Unless that amount finds a market, it is impossible for the American farmer to realize a price which will justify his raising the wheat.

I read a statement prepared by a financier of the Middle West, which I have seen verified several times and which I have no doubt is correct. If it is incorrect, the able Senator from Utah can correct me, because I know he is informed about these things. This statement says:

The decreased purchasing power of Europe from 1919 to 1921, inclusive, has a very vital relationship to the present agricultural depression in America. For instance, in 1919 Europe purchased 332,000,000 pounds of beef from the United States, but only 21,000,000 in 1921.

In other words, there was sold to Europe in 1921 about one-fifteenth of what was sold to Europe in 1919.

Europe purchased 1,238,000,000 pounds of bacon in 1919 but only 489,000,000 in 1921. \* \* \* What happened? The American live-stock industry became demoralized and the value of her live stock, approximately the same number of head, dropped from \$8,800,000,000 in 1919 to \$6,200,000,000 in 1921—a loss to the live-stock industry of America of about \$75,000,000 for each month of the entire 36 months—a total loss of \$2,600,000,000 to the live-stock industry in America.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. My friends, is not that a matter of supreme concern to the people of the United States, to the Senate of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, and to every business man in the United States? Could anything be more direct and essential for the consideration of this Government and its representatives than by some method to relieve that situation, whatever the method may be? You may pass tariff bills time out of mind, but unless the markets of Europe are restored upon these matters for which we must find a market in Europe, we will not enjoy the prosperity in this country which we have said to the American people they were to enjoy. It is indispensable; it is a part of our domestic policy; it is a matter which concerns us all. It is not the mere question of negotiating a treaty relating alone to foreign matters. It is dealing with a subject as wide and broad as the



conditions of the American people and the people of Europe combined can prevent.

Now I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. STANLEY. The Senator has anticipated me by making a very wholesome admission that tariff duties will not prevent a fall in the prices of articles when we cease to export them.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I am not going into a tariff debate. My vote upon the tariff question speaks for itself.

Mr. President, since my amendment was offered I do not know how many telegrams from farm organizations of the United States I have had, but a vast number. The members of those organizations are perfectly well aware of the situation. They know the condition which confronts us. They are not satisfied and will not be satisfied with having us pass a farm credit bill, which will only postpone the day of wrath in case this situation is not adjusted. They realize fully that they must have their foreign market. They are quite as keen in regard to this matter as those of us who have the honor to represent them here.

I have a communication from one farm organization in the Middle West, which says:

Do you know that in the last five months we have exported 45,000,000 bushels less of wheat than we did a year ago for the same period?

Do you know that when a Frenchman buys a bushel of wheat on account of the depreciation of francs that it costs him \$4? Do you know that Italy is again eating black bread? Do you know that Germany is again rationing flour? Do you know that a boy came to a bank here the other day and for \$5 bought 30,648 marks to be sent to his folks back home?

Do you know that our beef exports are only one-fifteenth of what they were in 1919, while Argentina's are greater every year? Do you know that Russia used to ship to western Europe 250,000,000 bushels of wheat every year? Do you know that there are 300,000,000 people of Europe who are being only partly fed but who if they were allowed to come anywhere near getting a square meal daily would more than consume all our surplus? Do you know that the world produced 1,000,000,000 bushels less of wheat in 1922 than it did in 1913? Do you know that Europe is desperately trying to buy our products, and paid us last year \$687,000,000 in gold and has paid us this year over \$400,000,000?

These are the conditions which lead me to believe that this is our question, this is our problem, from which we can not escape.

Another communication says:

The Ford County Farm Bureau members assembled in annual meeting believe that everything necessary should be done to restore the farmer's market. For our surplus production, this market is overseas. We realize that the question of the German reparations \* \* \* are inextricably interwoven.

Mr. President, there are not more goods in the world to-day than the world needs. There is not more food than the human family could properly use, and the peoples of the earth want to trade with one another. They want to deal with one another. They want to exchange the things which are rotting in their ground in some parts of the earth with those who are starving for them in other parts of the earth. They are not permitted to do so because of the political masters and political policies of Europe. They are kept from dealing with each other by reason of artificial conditions, and not by reason of reasonable or natural conditions.

We are just as much interested in that proposition as any nation in Europe or any people in Europe. It comes home to us in every vital way. It is menacing from an economic, and physical, and moral standpoint.

Mr. President, possibly I view the situation with too much concern. It may be that the impatience which I have no doubt we all feel at the slow recovery of economic health and at the tenacious hold which the spirit of turmoil and war maintain upon world affairs have clouded my view and distorted my outlook. But I do know that a deep and moving spirit of unrest, of discontent, has wrought upon our own people to their utter change in many ways. The fearful wave of lawlessness, the saturnalia of crime, which have swept over and engulfed this land for months, and which still linger, are not without a cause. The unusual apathy, the apparent indifference of entire communities, whole States, to these crimes are not natural to this people who have, through the century, built up a magnificent fabric of free government, the keystone of which, as they well know, is obedience to law. There is a cause for these things, an overwhelming cause. And I know of nothing which undermines the people's faith, which breaks down the nation's morale, like the fiscal policy which robs thrift of its savings, takes from frugality its reward, and plants the tax collector like a policeman upon his watch at the doorstep of every enterprising home. Why should men toil? Why save? Why plan for to-morrow? Rather, why not eat and drift and waste, for at the end of the year the result is

the same. Not only that, but desperate times are the harvest times of the usurer and the profiteer. Taking advantage of the necessities of the unhoused and the needy, of the farmer or business man in distress, they ply their trade with unchallenged and unlimited success. They wriggle their slimy way through the wreck of vanishing hopes and baffled efforts, and like the ghoul on the field of Waterloo, of whom Hugo speaks, cutting the jewels from the fingers of the dead and snatching mementoes from the clutches of the dying, escape at last with their stained and sordid plunder. These things, all these things, make for discouragement, make for demoralization, make for despair, make for crime. We have reached a point where a fight for fiscal relief is a fight for the American home, for the unity and stability of the family, for American manhood and womanhood, a fight for that citizenship—free, intelligent, hopeful, confident—which made America and which alone can preserve America.

This is the situation as I see it in my own country. Will any deny the serious conditions upon every hand? Now, sir, what is the plan? What is proposed to be done? If this plan is not wise, what is your plan? Are we to sit idle and listless while conditions grow worse? I will gladly yield to a wiser, more effective plan, but so long as no other is proposed I deem it not only right but a solemn duty to urge this course.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator holds the political masters of Europe responsible for erecting barriers against natural trade and exchange. Should he not also hold the political masters of the United States responsible for some of those barriers erected against international commerce? Have we not only recently passed a tariff law which makes it almost impossible for European countries to pay us in their products for the products of ours which they purchase over here?

Let me ask the Senator another question: Is his amendment broad enough, in his opinion, to permit the European nations at such a conference as he proposes to suggest to us that if we would lower our tariffs against European goods they would be enabled to buy our farm products?

Mr. BORAH. I would not have any fear of the President of the United States paying any attention to the suggestion. They could suggest that we give them a voice in financial legislation. But such suggestions no one would consider.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would his amendment be broad enough?

Mr. BORAH. I think it might for the suggestion. I am not so sensitive about the tariff act as some others, and so I do not worry about such suggestion. I think on the tariff the President would be equal to the occasion.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. I would like to suggest to the Senator that notwithstanding that last year was the shortest crop of cotton grown in the last 25 years—less than 8,000,000 bales—yet there were 2,800,000 bales carried over, and to-day the people in the South are selling their live stock by the hundreds because of the low prices prevailing, and laborers are leaving by the thousands.

Mr. BORAH. The senior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] just informs me that there was more cotton exported this year than last year. I think possibly that is true. It was stated the other day in a press dispatch that Russia had purchased a very large amount of cotton from southern planters. In spite of every effort upon our part, Russia has gotten back where she has become a purchaser from the United States, but by no grace of ours.

Mr. President, there is another reason why we should deal with the existing situation. I am not going to refer to it at length at this time. I have already spoken too long. It may come up later in the debate. There are humanitarian reasons not only in Europe but in this country which ought to inspire us with an effort to help to bring about a different condition of affairs. If we couple all the subject matters together—our presence in Europe, our getting deeper and deeper into the affairs of Europe, also the economic questions and humanitarian questions—from whatever point we may view the subject matter, it is certainly incumbent on the United States to move. If there is, as I said, a plan in hand or a scheme in process of being formed—if the negotiations which are reported in the newspapers between Mr. Morgan and other parties are ripening into final results which will be beneficial to the people of the



United States—and that is thought to be the best way to deal with the subject matter, I am perfectly willing, when the facts are presented, to consider them.

But certainly the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the leader of this body, will not take the position as a leader of the Senate and a leader of the Republican Party that we ought not to do anything. Certainly the Republican Party will not take the position that we ought not to have a program. Certainly we will not take the position that we ought not to proceed to exert whatever influence or power we have to bring about a satisfactory settlement of these conditions. We may fail. That is not impossible. We certainly will not accomplish it if we do not try. I know that there are many Members of this body who thought that the disarmament conference was a mere dream and that we should fail. But from the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts to-day we know that we did not fail. We brought back a remarkable result.

A year has passed since that time, and that year, my friends, has been as a century at other times. The things which have happened in Europe during the last year would scarcely have been recorded in a half century in ordinary times. Every budget in Europe is being increased by reason of those conditions. Taxes are being constantly laid upon the people by reason of those conditions. They are borrowing money day by day. I have upon my desk the report of a distinguished publicist and economist of the United States who has been abroad for three months, and who made a report of conditions, a report which I would not dare to read without his most pronounced consent. But they are nearing the brink. Chaos is ahead. Conditions are insufferable. The greatest legislative body in the world can not disregard those conditions.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, with very much of what was said by the able Senator from Idaho I agree. But I confess I have been astonished, as I am sure most of the Senators have been astonished who were present during the long, long fight upon the League of Nations and upon the four-power treaty and heard the Senator's eloquent speeches then insisting upon our remaining completely aloof from Europe and keeping out of European questions, with his position to-day, evidenced not only by his amendment, but by his speech, that he to-day is in favor of the United States thrusting itself into the very midst of the European problem. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the conversion of Saul of Tarsus was not more marked than the apparent conversion of the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. But the Senator from Wisconsin will remember that the conversion of the Saul of Tarsus saved his soul.

Mr. LENROOT. I would not for a moment intimate that that is the reason for the Senator's conversion.

Mr. GLASS. The conversion not only saved his life but some of us think it saved the life of the world.

Mr. LENROOT. I was only speaking of the facts and I do not in the least criticize the conversion, if such there be, because I find myself much more in accord with the Senator to-day than during the period to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I only desire to discuss very briefly one phase of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho. I assume that when the amendment is formally presented a point of order will be made against it and I think that the Chair upon the presentation of the matter will be convinced that the amendment is not in order and that such point of order must be sustained. But that discussion will more properly come when the matter is formally before the Senate. The part of the amendment which I desire to discuss is that part only authorizing and requesting the President to call an economic conference—

Charged with the duty of considering the economic problems now obtaining throughout the world with a view of arriving at such understandings or arrangements as may seem essential to the restoration of trade and to the establishment of sound financial and business conditions.

I can not support the proposition in its present form because it is without condition or limitation and, if adopted, would, in my judgment, build up in Europe false hopes of American relief and American participation in European affairs that could not be realized, and thus postpone and delay the economic rehabilitation of the world instead of advancing it. I believe it would defeat the very purpose that the Senator from Idaho has in mind in proposing it. That such a conference may be held in the near future, under proper conditions and with advance understandings as to the extent of America's participation in it, in my judgment is most desirable; but without such conditions and understandings we shall be doing Europe positive injury as well as ourselves if the United States shall take the initiative in calling it. If the amendment be adopted, all of Europe will accept it as an indication that public opinion in America with refer-

ence to the cancellation of her debts to us has changed, that Clemenceau's mission has been completely successful, that any concession made between European nations will be compensated for by the United States, and that we will stand as a rich and generous uncle, showering our wealth upon them. From the language of the amendment they would have a right to draw such conclusions, because if, as the Senator from Idaho suggests, the President in calling the conference shall attempt to safeguard it by the addition of a limitation they will be able to point to the action of the Congress of the United States where they have requested that the conference be held without condition or limitation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator take the position that neither the Executive nor the Congress should take any step in regard to the matter?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator admit the proposition as stated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that the President is now dealing with it?

Mr. LENROOT. I do accept it, and I hope it is true.

Mr. BORAH. Then that is liable to cause some false hopes in Europe also?

Mr. LENROOT. No—

Mr. BORAH. Possibly not.

Mr. LENROOT. The distinction is, as I think Senators must readily agree, that if the President, without any declaration either upon the part of Congress or upon his own part of being willing to enter into a conference without condition or limitation, makes the proposition that there must be some advance understanding as to the limitations and conditions under which he, as the President of the United States, will be favorable to such a conference, we are in a very different position than if Europe can point to action of the Congress requesting a conference without condition or limitation.

As further evidence of this—that is, the willingness of Congress to have a conference held without condition or limitation—as evidence of a change of opinion upon the part of the United States with reference to the cancellation of the foreign debt they can point to the fact that the proposal comes from the most distinguished isolationist in the United States, the most powerful and eloquent advocate of the complete aloofness of the United States in the political affairs of Europe, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. With all this, some deliver into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will find that although the distinguished Senator has at all times preached the doctrine of isolation he at the same time has said:

It is our solemn duty to say to them [Europe], "You can have all that is within our power as a prudent people to give, for we recognize both our obligations to humanity and our material interest in the cause, but you must conform your treaties to the law of live and let live. You must subscribe to the principles of reconstruction and not destruction. You, too, must become advocates and apostles of rehabilitation."

Those are the words of the Senator from Idaho. With all due respect to him, I do not believe that either his policy of isolation or his unbounded generosity under certain conditions meets the approval of the American people.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to say that I am very grateful to the Senator for finding that quotation, because I have been looking for it all morning.

Mr. LENROOT. I shall be glad to give the Senator a citation of where it can be found.

Mr. BORAH. It states exactly my position to-day. It states precisely my position. I have no desire to change a word or a punctuation.

Mr. LENROOT. I do not question that.

Mr. BORAH. It conforms exactly to what I am trying to do now.

Mr. LENROOT. Very well. Let us understand the purpose and object the Senator from Idaho himself has in the proposed amendment. It is that if Europe will conform to what he thinks Europe ought to do, there is no limit to what America will be willing to do for Europe, which includes, of course, the cancellation of her debt, and includes material help in every possible way. I for one am not willing, even if Europe does those things, to go as far as the Senator from Idaho expresses himself as willing to go.

Mr. BORAH. Would not the Senator be willing to go to the extent to which a prudent nation should go?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; to a certain degree.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I said.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; a prudent nation—give as much help as a prudent nation would be willing to give.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely.



Mr. LENROOT. That immediately carries the idea of what the resources of the United States are and what her resources will permit her to do. Of course, it would be at once said, and we would have to admit, that with the enormous wealth of the United States we should cancel every dollar of the \$11,000,000,000 of indebtedness and we would no doubt prosper permanently in the years to come just the same.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I have here a communication from the President written at the time the disarmament conference was sitting, in which he said:

I have said to inquirers, as I am now pleased to say to you, that it is not of particular concern to the administration what form the expression that Congress shall take, though it is most agreeable that Congress shall express itself in favor of securing, if possible, an international agreement upon a program for the limitation of armament.

Again:

It is wholly desirable to have the expression of a favorable opinion on the part of Congress relating to this world question, and it would seem to me ample if it should be expressed in the broadest and most general terms.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I am thoroughly in agreement with that expression of the President upon the subject to which it refers, which was the limitation of armaments. I can not conceive of any general language upon that subject which would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States or operate in effect as a postponement of the result that was desired. Here, however, we have a very different situation, where general language will not only involve the United States in questions in which the American people, in my opinion, are not willing to be involved but, in addition, will operate to postpone the very object that is sought to be secured by the proposal.

I appreciate, Mr. President, that the Senator from Idaho differentiates between an international economic conference and one having to do with political relations; but the two can not be separated. What is the dominant motive and mainspring of every political movement in Europe to-day? It is economic advantage, economic domination. That is true whether we turn to Germany, to Russia, or to Turkey. Why did England finance Greece to fight Turkey, and France and Italy finance Turkey to fight Greece? Was there any reason other than rivalry for economic domination or advantage in the Near East? Will anyone upon this floor pretend otherwise? No man in the Senate has declared more forcefully than has the Senator from Idaho that political sovereignty of a country is an empty shell if there be economic control of that country by another power. Senators will remember the vigorous speeches which the Senator from Idaho has made upon that subject in discussing the relations between Japan and China. In one of them he was led to exclaim, "What does sovereignty amount to if economic control of the situation is in the hands of another power?" It will also be remembered that the Senator from Idaho objected to our being represented on the Reparation Commission under the Versailles treaty upon the ground that it would embroil us in all the political affairs of Europe. No, Mr. President, the attempt to limit the proposed conference to economic questions, if we should go into it without other limitation or restriction, would let us into every European question which the Senator from Idaho for long years has insisted the United States should keep out of.

I have thus referred to the able Senator from Idaho because of his great ability, which is recognized in Europe as well as in America. This proposal coming from him assumes greater importance and will receive a different interpretation than if it had come from almost any other Member of this body. This amendment, if adopted, will convince Europe and the international bankers in America as nothing else could that the \$11,000,000,000 owing the United States by Europe will be forgiven and canceled. The Senator from Idaho has correctly described the insidious propaganda that has been going on in this country for the cancellation of the European debt to us; he has resisted it in the past most vigorously; and it is surprising that, unintentionally, no doubt, a proposal now comes from that Senator which will give that propaganda a new impetus and will certainly postpone the funding of that indebtedness by the debt commission which has been created by Congress.

Mr. President, I am not opposed to an economic conference, provided it be understood before we assume the responsibility for calling it that cancellation of the European debts to us shall not be one of the matters for discussion, and provided that the President of the United States will have some assurance from the leading powers of Europe that the matters for discussion shall be such as reach the heart of the European question, namely, the abandonment of present policies of economic exploitation and rivalry which are preventing the economic rehabilitation of Europe.

As to this matter, I am willing to trust President Harding and Secretary Hughes. Surely they are as much interested in the subject as is the Senate. They certainly have more information upon it than we have. They are in a position to secure conditions and limitations to such a conference as are utterly lacking in the proposal before us.

One word in conclusion with respect to the farm bloc and what the Senator from Idaho has stated as to the agricultural interests of the country. I am not a member of the farm bloc, but I understand that the proposal of the Senator from Idaho finds favor with many of them upon the theory that it will tend to increase the price of farm products. Let me warn them that, in my judgment, that will not be the case, for a postponement of the settlement of European affairs means continuous disadvantage to the farmers of America, and I believe if the Senate adopts this proposition it will mean postponement of the rehabilitation of Europe, for, as I stated in the beginning, it will raise false hopes in Europe which never can be realized.

May I refer for a moment to a little of the history in connection with the Limitation of Armament Conference? The proposal for that conference, like the proposal for this economic conference, came first, so far as the Senate is concerned, from the distinguished Senator from Idaho. The conference was called; it completed its work; and I believe in importance that conference was second to none in the history of international conferences; and yet I can not forget that the distinguished Senator from Idaho, who was the first proponent of that conference in the Senate, opposed with all his great power and ability the four-power treaty, which made the naval-limitation agreement possible. So, Mr. President, if the proposed conference be held without a limitation or condition, as is proposed by the Senator from Idaho, I am afraid that, if the conference should come to an agreement, some of the Senators who are now favoring the proposal would be the first, when a treaty came to the Senate to ratify the work of the economic conference, to oppose it and render for naught all the work which the economic conference had accomplished.

Mr. President, it should be understood once for all, and before any conference is called, that there will be no cancellation of the European debt to us; that that shall not be a subject for discussion in any economic conference. If France is right in her view that Germany alone, defeated and crushed, can pay reparations amounting to \$30,000,000,000, then surely Europe can in time to come pay her indebtedness to us of one-third as much, \$11,000,000,000. Let us leave the matter where it is now, with the President of the United States. We can trust him to act as soon as any good can be accomplished by action, and if at any time the President shall request the assent of Congress for such a conference, I am confident that Congress will speedily give its assent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has quite characteristically made a speech in a Shylock vein in favor of the utmost exaction of the pound of flesh. He has spoken of the European debt to America. There is not a European debt to America, and of course he knows that. There is a debt from Belgium, a debt from Serbia, a debt from Italy, a debt from France, a debt from Great Britain. They are individual national debts due to the United States. To try to cover them all under a general phrase of being the indebtedness of Europe to the United States is illogical to start with and stupid to end with. A man who might be very unwilling to cancel a debt that Italy, France, or Great Britain happened to owe the United States might be very willing to cancel a debt that Belgium, overriden without cause, never really a party to the war, or Serbia, dragooned and intimidated, happened to owe to the United States. The European debt to the United States reminds me of the common protective tariff nonsense about trade between Germany and the United States, or France and the United States, or between countries, when there is not any trade between countries at all, but the trade is between the individual citizens of one country with the individual citizens of the other.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned—and the Senator dared anybody to say anything in favor of the cancellation of any debt that anybody owed to the United States—I think we ought never to collect a dollar that Belgium owes us, and I think we ought never to collect a dollar that Serbia owes us. I do not think that a man would feel quite like a gentleman when he was presenting a bill to either one of them; but I want to collect all the balance, and the most part of it is upon the other side.

Mr. President, the quarrel between the Senator from Idaho on the one side and the Senator from Massachusetts, reinforced by the Senator from Indiana, upon the other side, as to whether our representative at Lausanne now is a participant or an observer, is really amusing to me, and I reckon it is



to you. It does not make any difference whether you call him a participant or whether you call him an observer; he is doing things, and he seems to be doing them on the pathway toward ultimate right. My only quarrel is that he is not doing enough things. He ought to read the riot act to the unspeakable Turk, and tell him that assassinations and rape have to stop, and stop right now, and that the United States says so. Call him an observer or call him a participant or call him whatever you please, as a Democrat I indorse President Harding's sending him there and having him do at least as much as he has done, and I hope he will have him do more.

Mr. President, it is a great thing to be a Democrat. It is one of the grandest privileges in the world just to be a Democrat, to believe in equal opportunities and to disbelieve in special privileges; but, Mr. President, there is something even greater than being a Democrat, and that is being an American—being a member of the English-speaking race which transplanted its institutions to America. I love the Senator from Idaho so much that nobody is more delighted than I am to find that he has finally discovered that these United States are a part of the earth, and that he has finally discovered today that these United States are a part of Europe.

Did you ever think of that? Every drop of blood in our veins, except the niggers and the Chinese and the Japanese in the United States, is European. Our ancestry is European. We are a part of Europe just as much as Magna Græcia was a part of Greece, just as much as the Sicilian colonies from Greece were a part of Greece. We are a part of Europe, and we can not help it. It is in our blood, it is in our bone, it is in our sinew. We are not niggers, and we are not Japanese, and we are not Chinese; we are Europeans, and I am delighted to notice that the Senator from Idaho has finally seemingly approximated that realization, merely approximated it.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the Senator's amendment. I have not consulted with anybody on this side nor with anybody on the other side, but I am in favor of it because it is "p'inted" the right way, as the darkies say; and I am opposed to any Lodge reservation, whether reinforced by the Senator from Indiana or by the Senator from Wisconsin, or not. God knows I have had enough of Lodge reservations to a generally idealistic purpose. I am in favor of the Senator's amendment, and I am opposed to any Lodge reservations. Lodge reservations can ruin anything that ever existed.

There is one thing, though, to which I wish to call attention before I sit down, because it was agreed to by both the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Wisconsin. They seem to think that the troubles of Europe now are economic. Well, of course, that is a part of the trouble, but the real trouble there, as during the entire history of the world it has been, is racial.

If you will let the energies of the people loose and quit confining them by governmental action, they will cure the economic troubles here and abroad; but nothing but the special grace of God can cure racial troubles between peoples. If we are to have another war soon in Europe, it will grow out of the Turk and the Balkans, and gradually Bulgaria and Greece and Serbia getting into it, and then finally the soviet in Russia backing the Turk out of hatred to civilization, not out of any natural affinity between Russians and Turks, and it will overflow the world. It is not economic at all. Of course, a part of the trouble with trade and exchange is economic, but there is no danger of war from economics at all. I have witnessed men here on this floor, at the beginning of the war between the Allies and Germany, and about the time we were participating in it, talking about it as if it were a contest of forces to out-trade one another. It had no more to do with that than it had with the wound on my off thumb, which was secured by slamming a door—nothing. The real trouble was growing out of a racial gospel that the Germans had preached for 40 years, recommending themselves to the other nations as being the chosen race of the world, and the balance of us as being degenerates. That was adopted by some college professors who were educated in Germany, and by three or four Senators upon this floor, strange as it may seem. They more or less admitted that the Germans were a superior race, most highly scientific, far ahead of us or anybody else; and it took us on the battle field, man to man, to prove to the German that he was not the special favorite of God at all. The trouble in Europe to-day is not chiefly economic at all, and when the Senator from Wisconsin says he is afraid that the amendment of the Senator from Idaho may go beyond that I hope he is right, because then maybe they can strike the center of the disease.

One more thing, Mr. President: The Senator from Idaho wanted to know why our few troops were still upon the Rhine. He pretended that he did not know why we were still upon the

Rhine. We were parties to the armistice into which Germany entered. One of the terms of the armistice was that we were to occupy the gateways across the Rhine, the Allies and the associated nations, and we are occupying the gateway at Coblenz; and, unless we withdraw from our plighted word under the terms of the armistice, we must continue to keep the United States flag there. It does not take many troops. It does not take any war; but the Senator from Idaho said that what we meant by keeping the troops there, to try to quote him accurately—I believe I took it down—was giving notice to Germany that we were there. That is just what it means. We did not fight this war for nothing. We did not whip Germany for nothing.

I have nothing against the German people. I love them. I have a whole lot of friends among them. I was partially educated amongst them. But we did not fight this war for nothing. We did not whip Germany for nothing. We did not enter into the armistice for nothing. We gave Germany notice when we entered into the armistice that she had to observe the terms of it, and although we never became party to the Versailles treaty we are still parties to the armistice. The Senator from Idaho is right. We are staying there to give notice to Germany—notice by our mere flag and a thousand men, I believe it is about a thousand—that she must remember and she shall not forget why we are there.

Again I say, it is a proud thing to be a Democrat, but it is a better thing to be an American; and I indorse President Harding's course in keeping those troops there, and I for one, am not afraid to say so.

The Senator from Idaho read a whole lot of communications from what he calls foreign-born societies that he said were constituents of his. They are not constituents of mine. Whenever a man hyphenates himself he is, in my opinion, not an American, and nobody except Americans are constituents of mine. No Irish-American or German-American or Italian-American or Hungarian-American or any other sort of hyphenated cattle has ever been invited by me to vote for me, and never will be. The minute they make up their minds to be Americans and leave out the hyphen, and to quit bringing European special interests into American elections, then they can count themselves as constituents of mine, but until they do they can not. Perhaps it is not a very proud thing to be a constituent of mine, but in my private opinion it is a very important thing; and no man can be a constituent of mine who is not an American, and an American all over, and is not willing to leave out his hyphen.

The Senator from Idaho refers to how much it is costing Germany to keep our American troops there. Well, thus far it has not cost Germany anything, if I am correctly informed. Under the terms of the armistice she agreed to pay, but she has not paid. By the way, as far as I can find out, she has not paid anything much, either under the treaty or under the armistice; so the Senator need not distress himself to death and have the stomach ache because of what Germany is paying for the occupation of our troops upon the Rhine. I am not quite certain about my facts, but if I have my facts right she has not paid anything, except during the first year, toward our troops occupying the Rhine. America has been in that, as she has been in everything else, financially unselfish. Whatever else may be said about us—lying down on our arms after the war was over, instead of extending the great success and triumph into peace, as we ought to have done—whatever else may be said about us, we have not been stingy about money. Thank God for that! We have been a gentleman nation when it came to the pocketbook. We have pulled out our money to feed and to clothe them, and we have left off all claims of ours against them for anything that ever happened. We have been a gentleman nation when it came to the pocketbook, and so we have not forced Germany to observe her armistice terms in paying for our army of occupation on the Rhine. If I am correctly informed, and I think I am, she has not paid one-tenth of it. In fact I believe—perhaps the Senator from Utah may remember better than I—that she paid only the first year; it may have been the first two years. Does the Senator remember?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I do not remember just how much it was, but it was a very small amount.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, she has paid very little; so the Senator from Idaho need not go out stomach aching about our oppression of the Germans because of having a few of our men on the Rhine.

Mr. President, I remember that soon after the war was over there were men on this floor who rose time and again to vilify and vituperate Germany about everything in the world that they could think of, because that was temporarily popular then. I



remember that I had to check one or two of them; and now I find that the same men who were going too far in "cussing" Germany are going too far in consciously or unconsciously embracing German propaganda—I think mainly unconsciously. They do not know exactly what is being done, nor how it happens that they are doing it, but, anyhow, they are doing it.

Mr. President, I welcome every step, even though a short step, toward understandings between the nations and the peoples of the world. I was one of the very few men upon this side of the Chamber who voted for the four-power treaty. As I said to a distinguished Democrat who was on the other side of that question, I can not well see how I, who have advocated a league of peace between all the nations of the earth, could afford to oppose a league of peace between four nations of the earth. It is different in degree, but it is the same in kind.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the amendment of the Senator from Idaho is going to do any particular good; I do not believe it is ever going to be allowed to come to a vote at this session, and I do not think it is going to be adopted. When I say it is not going to do any particular good, I mean unless the President is with it. Of course, if the President sends word to his men on the other side that he would like to have them vote for the Borah amendment it will be agreed to, and it will do some good; but if the President sends word to them that he does not want them to do it, it is not going to be agreed to, and it will not do any good, because it is never going to be enacted. But I am in favor of a dream, even if it is nothing but a dream, that looks toward peace on earth and good will among men.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask that we proceed with the consideration of the committee amendments to the pending bill.

Mr. KING. I understood that the committee amendments were all disposed of.

Mr. POINDEXTER. At least one of them was passed over.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Hale	Lodge	Poindexter
Bayard	Harris	McCormick	Pomerene
Borah	Harrison	McCumber	Reed, Mo.
Brookhart	Heflin	McKellar	Sheppard
Cameron	Hitchcock	McKinley	Smoot
Capper	Johnson	McNary	Stanfield
Caraway	Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Sterling
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	New	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Nicholson	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Norbeck	Underwood
Dial	Keyes	Oddie	Warren
Fernald	King	Page	Watson
Fletcher	Ladd	Pepper	Weller
France	La Follette	Philips	Williams
Gerry	Lenroot	Pittman	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

The READING CLERK. The pending amendment is, on page 13, line 21, in the items for the Naval Reserve Force and Naval Militia, where the committee proposes to strike out "\$2,800,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "\$3,800,000."

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before a vote is taken upon that I would like to ask the Senator from Washington having the bill in charge what reasons prompted the committee to increase the appropriation carried in the bill as it passed the House. As the Senator knows, the House committee had very full hearings, and I am advised that some testimony was presented with reference to this particular subject. The Senate committee has seen fit to increase the appropriation approximately a million dollars. Will the Senator advise the Senate the reasons which induced the committee to make such a large increase?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, the purpose of the increase reported by the committee was to provide retainer pay for the volunteer Naval Reserve upon the same basis as is provided for the Federalized National Guard among our land forces. To all intents and purposes, while it is called a naval reserve, it is a naval militia. In order to induce men to interest themselves in the necessary training and to hold themselves in readiness for service in case of an emergency, certain retainer pay, equivalent to two months' pay of their several grades, is provided by the law.

When they have complied with the requisite drills and subjected themselves to the required amount of training they are eligible to be enrolled. When they are enrolled they are entitled to retainer pay. Last year the bill carried about the amount the bill carried this year as it came from the House without the Senate amendment, and in order to get along at all the Naval Reserve was not enrolled during the first six

months in the year; so the amount of money by which the appropriation was short was saved.

The first six months of the fiscal year was chosen by the department as the period in which the reserve would not be enrolled. They are expected to be enrolled on the 1st day of January and to be paid their retainer pay from that time until the 30th day of June. When that time arrives, unless the increased amount reported by the Senate committee is appropriated, they will have to be disenrolled again, and if that should occur, it is the opinion of those who are responsible and especially informed and especially active in the preservation of this civilian naval force, the Naval Reserve, that it would mean the destruction of the reserve; that if they are disenrolled again it would be impossible to retain such an interest in the reserve that they could ever again be enrolled.

They are expected to enroll on the 1st day of January, through the representations which have been made to them by their friends that they have reason to believe that provision would be made by Congress to keep them upon the enrolled list throughout the year after that time. These men are put upon Eagle boats and given two weeks' training at sea every year. In addition to that, they are required once a week to attend drills in armories, which are more or less makeshift affairs, no appropriation being made for the armories sufficient to procure the proper kind of armory. In their two weeks' training at sea 5 officers and 56 men are put upon a boat, and they are given very active boat drills; they are given instruction in engineering; they are given instruction in navigation, instruction in all duties of a seaman, and follow a very rigid regimen for the period of their active training. This amendment is offered to provide that retainer pay.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the Senator from Washington, in charge of the bill, if he desires to proceed with the last clause of the bill to-night? There are several who want to speak upon this matter and are not ready to speak to-night.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has one or two matters he desires to present, one of them relating to the Marine Corps. That is the only remaining matter I know of to be presented, aside from the one of which the Senator from Idaho speaks. If anybody is prepared to speak this evening upon the question of the proposed conference, it seems to me it is a very appropriate time to proceed with that; but I will not ask that the matter be concluded this afternoon.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I have no objection to anyone speaking who wants to speak.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am perfectly willing, when we have proceeded as far as Senators are prepared to proceed, that we shall take a recess until to-morrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to offer two amendments, Mr. President. I will be glad to state at this time what the amendments refer to. I desire to have the number of the enlisted personnel of the Navy reduced. One amendment provides for a reduction of the enlisted personnel of the Navy from 86,000 to 67,000, that being the number suggested by the committee itself, as I understand its report. I suppose the amendment will go over until to-morrow.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think it very doubtful whether it will be reached this afternoon.

Mr. McKELLAR. We can vote upon it at any time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I wish to express the hope to those having charge of the naval appropriation bill that they will press it as vigorously as possible, so as not to hold back the unfinished business too long.

Mr. KING. May I say in reply to the Senator from Washington that I do not think he should by his admonition criticize the Senate. Here is a bill carrying an appropriation of more than \$325,000,000. Just one day has been spent in the consideration of the bill with that large appropriation. To-day has been consumed in the discussion of a very important question, and it is obvious that the bill will be passed by to-morrow. Certainly a bill which only takes three days to dispose of, though carrying these enormous appropriations, ought not to excite the ire of my friend from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I certainly did not manifest any indication of ire or anything of the sort, and it never entered my mind that I was criticizing the Senate or any Senator. I just thought that we should not adjourn at 4 or half past 4 o'clock without pressing the bill as much as possible and getting as much of it disposed of as possible. Of course, I did not make that suggestion with any idea of pressing Senators into debate when they had not had time to prepare. I merely wanted to express the hope that I did express, that the naval appropriation bill would be pressed as rapidly as it properly could be. But in



doing that I wish to say to the Senator that I never thought of criticizing any Senator or the Senate or expressing any impatience, because there has not been any unnecessary delay in connection with the bill.

Mr. KING. It occurs to me that if the Senate would give more consideration to these enormous appropriations, it would be for the best interests of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and is in charge of the pending appropriation bill. I should like to ask him to what extent the amount appropriated in the bill is lessened by the action of the disarmament conference which was held about a year ago. I recall that it was promised to us then that if that treaty were ratified, the expense of naval armament would be greatly reduced. That was one of the reasons, I think, why many Senators voted for the ratification of the conference action. If the Senator will give us the figures of the extent to which the cost of the Government has been relieved of the burden of naval taxation by reason of the accomplishments of the disarmament conference, I shall be glad to have them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The amount is something like \$180,000,000 in this bill; that is, comparing the needs for the ensuing fiscal year, for which the bill will provide, and those of the fiscal year 1922-23, the current fiscal year, which were \$180,000,000 less than the actual appropriations for the last year under the building program of 1916, which was modified by the naval limitation of armaments treaty.

Mr. McKELLAR. My recollection is that we appropriated last year substantially the same amount of money that it is proposed to appropriate this year. Is not that correct?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It was just about the same approximately. The Senator will remember that last year's appropriation act was passed subsequent to the Armament Limitation Conference, and the reason why it was approximately the same as this year's bill was because of the suspension of the great naval program in which the United States was engaged prior to that conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Even now we are spending on our Navy about twice as much as we spent the last year before the war. Is not that true? We are spending more money by about 50 per cent than Germany ever spent on her navy in her palmiest days. Am I not correct in that? And still we are talking about peace and peace conferences. It looks to me like there is in the bill considerable preparation for war. Three hundred million dollars in round numbers are appropriated in the bill, and my recollection is that before the war we appropriated about \$150,000,000 a year for our Navy, and built up a great Navy under those appropriations. Now, we are nearly doubling that amount under the pending bill, even after the peace conference.

Mr. POINDEXTER. For the fiscal year 1917, the appropriations made during 1916, which was before we were in the war, the bill carried \$312,755,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will remember that was in preparation for the war. What was it the year before?

Mr. POINDEXTER. For the year 1916 it was \$147,533,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and for a number of years prior thereto, before we actually were preparing for the war, it did not exceed that amount. Of course, we were preparing for war in 1916, as we all know. In the appropriation act for 1917 we were doing likewise, but prior to that we built up our Navy under appropriations of approximately \$150,000,000 a year, and for a number of years previously a much less sum each year.

Mr. POINDEXTER. We could go along this year on \$147,000,000 if it were the desire to go back to the before-the-war establishment, but we would have the smallest and the most incomplete Navy of all the great powers of the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought one of the purposes of the disarmament conference was that we should reduce the expense of naval armament; but, instead of reducing, the Senator admits that we are going beyond what we did before the war by about 100 per cent.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am not responsible for the expectations which the Senator from Tennessee may have had as to what reductions would be brought about. I think it is very probable that many people imagined there would be a doing away with the naval expenditures in large measure as a result of the scrapping of the partly constructed increase of the Navy—the battleships and battle cruisers.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think many people were deceived by it at all.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It has not come up to their expectations as to doing away entirely with naval expenditures, but

it has reduced the amount, as I have already pointed out to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. While I am on my feet I want to ask the Senator with reference to the enlisted men. I want to read from page 6 of the report of the committee which the Senator submitted on the pending bill. I read, for the purpose of asking him a question, as follows:

The appropriations proposed in this bill are on the basis of continuing the enlisted strength at 88,000 men. The committee made a very exhaustive study of the enlisted personnel requirements when considering the estimates for the current fiscal year and reached the conclusion that 67,000 enlisted men would provide adequately for the maintenance of the so-called treaty Navy, but only last April the House itself, contrary to the committee's recommendation, decided that 88,000 men should be allowed and nothing has arisen during the few intervening months that would warrant the committee in proposing a smaller number than the House so recently expressed itself as favoring.

Now, as I understand the excerpt from the committee's report, the committee believes that under the treaty arrangement, the disarmament arrangement, 67,000 men would be sufficient for the Navy, but that because the House last year voted for 88,000 men, the committee are willing to forego their own views after an exhaustive study of the subject and report for 88,000. Is that correct?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think the error into which the Senator from Tennessee has fallen is that he has the House committee report and the Senate committee report mixed up.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have here a report headed "Mr. Poindexter, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report," and included in that report is the report of the House committee from which I have just read. I supposed that when the Senator from Washington incorporated the House committee report into his report he recommended what the House committee report recommended.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Oh, no. We have shown that we did not do that by the amendments we have made to the House bill. We incorporated the House report—

Mr. McKELLAR. It was incorporated in the Senate committee report.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understood the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I was going to explain why we incorporated the House report in our report. It was to show what the House report was, not necessarily that we indorsed everything that was in the House report. It is a quite clear and able statement of the views of the House committee and in general of the contents of the bill, because there were very few changes made in it by the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I understand the Senator does not agree with the House committee report which was submitted with his committee report, that 67,000 men are sufficient?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not agree, when the Senator reads from a report that the committee was of the opinion that 67,000 men were enough, that that was the Senate committee, which I understood him to intimate. It was the House committee that said that and not the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it the Senator's opinion that that number was not sufficient?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It certainly is. My opinion is that it was entirely inadequate and would put the Navy back somewhat on the basis existing before the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it would be very different.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It practically would deprive the Navy of its position as a sea power compared with the other sea powers of the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now read further from the report which is submitted, together with the report of the Senator from Washington, as follows:

It was the position of the committee at that time—

That is when it made this exhaustive investigation after the disarmament conference—

that 50,000 men afloat would suffice for the 18-battleship fleet and all of the other types of vessels it was planned to keep in commission to round out that fleet and for special and detached service, and that 17,000 additional men would adequately take care of such shore assignments as it was usual and customary to fill with enlisted men, and allow a margin for men under training and in transit. Of course, the committee realized that the adoption of its proposal would have made it necessary, so far as the shore force was concerned, to exercise the closest supervision over the assignment and detail of men, and there would have been no reservoir from which enlisted men might be assigned to take the places of civilians forced out by reason of curtailed appropriations or to fill billets which properly should be filled by civilians.

Now, Mr. President, I find that the House committee, after an exhaustive examination of the subject, thought there was no need for more than 50,000 men. I will ask the Senator what



examination his committee made as to the number of men required?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not know how much into detail the Senator desires us to go.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Senate committee make any investigation at all?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It made a very exhaustive investigation, and that investigation was reported and printed in the hearings before the Senate committee of last year. The entire matter was fought out at the last session in a more or less sensational controversy on the floor of the House of Representatives.

It attracted the attention of the whole country, and any information which it was possible to obtain was used by one side or the other in the exhaustive debate on the floor of the other House. The same question, to a large extent, arose in the consideration of the naval appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1922. The Senate committee went into it in connection with that bill; they have repeatedly gone into an examination of the question as to the sufficiency of the personnel, and all of the testimony relative to that matter is contained in the hearings.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Washington will permit me to ask him another question in my own time I desire to inquire what is the average cost of the maintenance of an enlisted man in the Navy?

Mr. POINDEXTER. It is approximately a thousand dollars a year, although I should have to examine the matter to give the Senator the exact amount.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator's figures must be wrong. It costs nearly \$1,800 a year for an enlisted man in the Army, and I imagine the cost of an enlisted man in the Navy would certainly be approximately the same, at any rate. The Senator's figures go back about 15 years, when the cost of an enlisted man in the Navy and the Army approximated \$1,000 a year, but now it approximates something like from \$1,500 to \$1,800 a year. I thought perhaps the Senator from Washington had the figures before him, having had hearings in his committee about the matter.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I have not the figures before me, but I will say there is a very great difference between the cost of the Army Establishment and the Navy Establishment. Quarters have to be provided for soldiers but they do not have to be provided, except to a very limited extent, for seamen.

Mr. McKELLAR. Except for those who were on shore duty; but the average would be considerably over \$1,000 a year. I am quite sure it would be not less than \$1,500 a year.

Mr. President, I wish to say in regard to this matter that having 86,000 men in our Navy at this time is practically without justification. My understanding is that England, with her navy, which is much larger than ours, has not that many men now; that she has reduced her naval force constantly since the World War. It is the part of wisdom to do that. The number of men now in our Navy is too large; their maintenance is very expensive. A reduction in the enlisted personnel of the Navy from 86,000 to 67,000, as proposed in the amendment which I have offered, would effect a saving to the Government of \$30,000,000 a year, and I doubt if the retention of the additional 19,000 men would amount to a row of pins in the event we had trouble, for we should have to enlist a very much larger number of men immediately the war broke out. In my judgment, there is no reason in the world for putting this enormous cost for enlisted men upon the people of the United States at this time. We ought to follow the example of other nations. Whether we are going to live up to our treaty agreements or our professions when we participated in the disarmament conference or not, we certainly ought to act with prudence and caution, and not recklessly throw away the people's money, as we are evidently proposing to do in the pending bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee addressed to me a moment ago as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee a question relative to some of the provisions of the pending bill. I wish to state to him that under the new rules of the Senate the members of the Naval Affairs Committee—at least most of them—have absolutely nothing to do with the preparation of the naval appropriation bill. Therefore any information which I may have as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee is that which I have obtained from a perusal of the bill and from the reading of the testimony which was given before the House committee and the very limited amount of testimony which was taken by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator from Utah should hardly have stated that the Committee on Naval Affairs has nothing to do with the framing of the naval bill.

Mr. KING. I had not quite completed my statement.

Mr. WARREN. As a matter of fact, the Committee on Naval Affairs, under the rules of the Senate, choose three of their members to sit with the Appropriations Committee in considering the bill. No action is taken of any kind regarding the appropriations for the Navy by the Appropriations Committee without those members of the Naval Affairs Committee, both in the subcommittee and in the meeting of the general committee, being present; and they are always represented on the conference committee by one or two, and probably in the next conference they will be represented by three members. The Senator from Utah should keep that in mind.

Mr. KING. I had that in mind, and if the Senator from Wyoming had permitted me to complete the paragraph of my speech I should have explained the broad statement which I made was subject to the qualification which is contained in the rule to which I called attention; that a certain number of members of the Committee on Naval Affairs—and in this instance three—are selected to participate in the deliberations of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate in the preparation of the naval appropriation bill. However, I do not happen to be one of those three, so I may state broadly that only three members of the Naval Affairs Committee had anything to do with the preparation of the bill, and the remainder of us have only that information which we have acquired from an examination of the bill and the testimony before the House committee and the limited testimony which was taken before the Senate committee. So I can not give the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] the full information which he desired relative to the items to which he directed attention.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was called out of the Chamber for a moment and did not hear the statement of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. I have just been explaining that under the new rules of the Senate the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, with the exception of three, have nothing to do with the preparation of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand about that.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a moment ago we were discussing the item on page 13 of the pending naval appropriation bill relative to the Naval Reserve. The Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER] has given the reasons which actuated the Senate committee in increasing the appropriation above that carried in the House bill.

I have an open mind, let me say to the Senator, upon this subject. I profess to having but a limited amount of information respecting it. At first blush, it is a proposition that would address itself with a great deal of sympathy to my views. If we can have a naval reserve, although costing the people by taxation a comparatively large amount, which would be of value in the event of war, I can see that a measure that would execute that plan ought to commend itself to the country and to the Senate; but with the information which I have obtained I have reluctantly reached the conclusion that the plan thus far has not met with the success which many predicted and has many infirmities which are inherent and fundamental which prevent its being as successful as its proponents declared that it would be.

In the first place, our country is so large that any plan which might be successfully carried out in Great Britain, for instance, in the maintenance of a naval reserve could not as successfully be executed here. A number of persons who belong to the Naval Reserve, one officer and several enlisted men, have conferred with me in regard to the matter, and they declare that under the plan which has heretofore been adopted the results have not been commensurate with the expenditure. They state that only a few, perhaps 8,000 officers and men—and nearly one-half of them are officers—have maintained any connection whatever with the organization. They say that those who have associated themselves with the reserve have been persons residing in a few large cities or, at least, where the population is congested, so that we do not get a reserve which is based upon the population or which takes into account the wide extent of our great territorial domain. There are a considerable number of naval reservists in New York, in Boston, in Chicago, and a few other cities where the population is great, but in Iowa, Indiana, the great Mississippi Valley, and in the intermountain region, remote from the sea, there are but a very few members of the Naval Reserve, who have the advantage of the training, aside from the two weeks training which it is supposed will be given during the year. Of course, I can understand that a considerable number residing in the interior would join the reserve, if not for patriotic motives, for the opportunity of going to the seacoast for two weeks during the summer at the



pay which is allowed in the grade to which they belong, but if any benefit is to be derived from the training aside from the two weeks it will be confined largely and almost wholly to the few who belong to the reserve and who are found in the congested centers of population. That criticism was made. It was said that the talk about benefit being derived from the training is without any particular merit, and that but very few, if any, in the rural districts will obtain the benefit of the training. I am speaking now of the training aside from the two weeks at sea.

Another objection which was made by one of the young men who belonged to the Naval Reserve arose out of the fact, he said, that the boats upon which they were placed were not the ones which would be utilized in the event of war. The reserves are not placed upon battleships or battle cruisers or swift cruisers or torpedo boats or, at least, destroyers; but, as was indicated by the Senator from Washington, they are placed upon the little Eagle boats. It is quite likely that some benefit may be derived from training upon the Eagle boats, but, if I am to judge from the statement made to me by the gentleman to whom I refer, the benefit which is derived from the two weeks' cruise upon the Eagle boats is not very great and is not commensurate with the expenditure which is made. He ventured the assertion that it would be far better to enlarge the Navy, if that is what is desired, by a thousand seamen; and he said far better results would be attained with the augmentation of the Navy by 1,000 men than by the maintenance of the Naval Reserve system.

It does seem to me that if we are going to have the reserve the present plan should be greatly modified, simplified, and improved. There ought to be some plan by which the reservists will receive intensive training upon boats which will be used during war, not upon boats which are obsolete and which would give them no particular training that would be advantageous to them in the event of a naval conflict.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment which has been offered by the committee and support the provision as it came from the House. The House committee, as I have heretofore stated, gave a great deal of attention to this bill; that is, they gave it far more attention than did the Senate committee; and yet I am constrained to say that an examination of the testimony which was submitted before the House committee leaves very much to be said in favor of a fuller examination of witnesses. Much of the examination consists of the mere presentation by the naval officers of their demands.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there was a much more complete showing made before the Senate Appropriations Committee or the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the subject of a Naval Reserve. Captain Parker, of Boston, who is probably more familiar with the subject than is any other individual, appeared before the committee and also prepared a written statement, which is much more definite and much more instructive than are the hearings from which the Senator has read.

Mr. KING. I was not reading from the House hearings with respect to this particular item. I was speaking generally and stating that while the House hearings were much fuller, generally speaking, and comprised a volume of seven or eight hundred pages, there was much left unsaid that ought to have been said to enable persons who desired to ascertain the condition of the Navy and the need of these appropriations to form a matured judgment as to the justification for these enormous appropriations. I have read what was stated in the Senate hearings, but the Senator will bear me out when I state that the Senate hearings were very much abbreviated. Perhaps there is less than 100 pages in the aggregate in the Senate hearing and six or seven or eight hundred pages in the House hearings.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will pardon an interruption, when Captain Parker came here and testified before the Senate committee on the subject of the Naval Reserve we did not have a stenographer, and we held up the proceedings for 15 or 20 minutes waiting to get one, but could not get one; so his testimony does not appear in the hearings. It was very illuminating testimony on this subject, and I am sorry the Senator could not have heard it.

Mr. KING. I say I have read all the hearings which have been published, both before the House committee and before the Senate committee; and I confess that with respect to the Naval Reserve the testimony is very unsatisfactory, as it is with respect to many other items that are found in this bill.

Mr. HALE. The Senator has spoken about the proportion of officers to men in the reserve. I take it that he gets this information from page 151 of the House hearings. I myself made the same mistake that the Senator made. As a matter of fact, when a large number of men in the Naval Reserve were disenrolled, a small number of them went into class 6, which gets no pay. This table represents substantially that number of men. Quite a large number of officers stayed in class 6, but the men mostly went out. Since that time they have been building up the organizations and getting the men to enlist.

On page 151 the statement is made that at Portland, Me.—my own home town—there were seven officers and four men. I took exception to this when the matter came up in the committee, and I recalled that we used to have a Naval Reserve company there of something over 100 men and a proper number of officers, and the city of Portland took a great pride in the company. That seemed to be very different from the conditions mentioned in this statement. I now find, on talking with Captain Parker, who has charge of the first district, that they already have 8 officers and 30 men enrolled.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator what is the total number of officers and men now in the Reserve Force?

Mr. HALE. Until the 1st of January these men do not go in under pay. They simply remain in class 6; and that list on page 151 represents those men who were in class 6. Under the new arrangement, instead of 4,000 officers there will be somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000. They will not all go into the new class under pay, and the number of men will be cut down from 8,000 to somewhere below 6,000.

Mr. KING. Then, if I understand the Senator, with the enlarged appropriation carried by the Senate bill there will be less than 1,500 officers and approximately 5,000 men?

Mr. HALE. No; next year there will be more than 1,500. They hope to have 2,000 officers and substantially 6,000 men, whereas the appropriation for this year provided for 1,500 officers and 5,000 men, but applies for only six months of the year. If the Senator will read the hearings of last year he will see that the statement was made that they did not have retainer pay enough to take care of this full number of men, and therefore that they could only pay them for one-half the year. This year we hope to pay them for the full year.

Mr. KING. A reference to the House hearings, at pages 151 and 152, shows that the number of reservists attached to each station in each district, as shown upon those pages, is 4,440 officers and 8,751 men.

Mr. HALE. Those men do not go under pay, however.

Mr. KING. That is for 1924.

Mr. HALE. Those are the men who are enrolled in class 6 and who are not under pay. When they are taken in under the provisions of this bill they will be cut down in number and a certain number of them will go under pay.

Mr. KING. Then what becomes of the residue?

Mr. HALE. They keep on in class 6 without pay.

Mr. KING. What sort of an organization do they have and what drill?

Mr. HALE. They are honorary naval reserves, practically. They do not get any retainer pay.

Mr. KING. They do no drilling?

Mr. HALE. Not under pay.

Mr. KING. Neither on shore nor at sea?

Mr. HALE. No.

Mr. KING. Then what advantage are they to the Navy?

Mr. HALE. They are interested in the reserve. They simply keep on and hold themselves in readiness in case of a war. They do not get any retainer pay at all.

Mr. KING. May I inquire of the Senator how the authorities would discriminate if all of them desired to join and get on the pay roll?

Mr. HALE. They would pick out the ones that were most suitable for the work.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that we ought to limit the number?

Mr. HALE. I do.

Mr. KING. At any rate, the proposition now is to expend approximately \$4,000,000 for the Naval Reserve, and with that \$4,000,000 to get enrolled approximately 1,500 to 2,000 officers and 5,000 men?

Mr. HALE. Five to six thousand men, yes; and I think it would be very well worth while for the country if we could make the plan successful.

Mr. KING. The Senator has heard the criticism that I made in regard to the present system. The Senator, as a member of the committee, has gone into the matter more fully than I



have, and I should like to inquire of him whether he is satisfied with the present system.

Mr. HALE. The Senator means with this system?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. HALE. For the Naval Reserve?

Mr. KING. With the present law.

Mr. HALE. I think eventually we shall have to enact a fuller Naval Reserve law. I think we should take that up in the Naval Committee, of which the Senator is a member.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps I did not understand the Senator from Maine. Did I understand him to say that these officers and men in the Naval Reserve do not drill?

Mr. HALE. Not these men that are left in class 6. All of the men that come under the appropriation in the bill will drill.

Mr. McKELLAR. All of them will drill?

Mr. HALE. They will.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I am willing to take a vote. I think we should reject the Senate amendment and adhere to the House provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business to-day it take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, in the items for the Naval Reserve Force and Naval Militia, on page 13, line 21, to change the total from "\$2,994,000" to "\$3,994,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee about a provision in the bill, on page 9, for the Office of Naval Intelligence. I see that there is \$30,000 appropriated for that purpose. Can the Senator tell us anything about the advantage of an appropriation of that kind? I call his attention to the fact that some days ago there was printed in the papers a statement from New York showing that more than \$1,000,000 worth of Navy material had been stolen and that the Office of Naval Intelligence knew nothing about it, and it was ascertained through arrests made at the instance of the Department of Justice. If such is the case, if the Office of Naval Intelligence does not function, if it does not prevent this kind of a theft, why should we appropriate the amount contained in this proviso for that purpose?

Mr. POINDEXTER. What proviso does the Senator refer to?

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 9, the Office of Naval Intelligence.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Has the Senator any other criticism of the Office of Naval Intelligence except what he has just mentioned?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should say that this was enough. I read from the Evening Star of December 20 the headline:

Million-dollar theft from navy yard is charged to 23. Twenty-two are arrested in New York by Federal agents. Clothing and material is taken by truck load. Detectives pose as thieves, are accepted by men, and get evidence.

Without reading all the article, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to put the whole article in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hearing none, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, December 20, 1922.]  
\$1,000,000 THEFT FROM NAVY YARD IS CHARGED TO 23—22 ARE ARRESTED IN NEW YORK BY FEDERAL AGENTS—CLOTHING AND MATERIAL ARE TAKEN BY TRUCK LOAD—DETECTIVES POSE AS THIEVES, ARE ACCEPTED BY MEN, AND GET EVIDENCE.

(By the Associated Press.)

NEW YORK, December 20.—Twenty-two civilian employees at the Brooklyn Navy Base were arrested to-day on indictments returned several months ago by a Federal grand jury charging that Government property to the value of more than \$1,000,000 had been stolen since the war.

The arrests were made by agents of the Department of Justice.

The grand jurors indicted 23 men after its investigation of the alleged wholesale thefts, which the authorities said included clothing, oil, and various other materials used at the navy yard. The twenty-third man under indictment was not found to-day. The investigation has been under way for months.

#### YARD DETECTIVES FAIL.

Navy intelligence officers undertook to find out the cause for the discrepancies between the inventories and the stock supposed to be on hand; but the thieves were too cunning for the regular naval detective force, the members of which were apparently well known to those who were doing the stealing.

William J. Burns, chief of the bureau of investigation of the Department of Justice, then was asked for help, and ordered Edward J. Brennan, head of the bureau's New York office, to assign operatives.

Brennan consulted Police Commissioner Enright and borrowed the services of Detective Francis Trainor.

Under the direction of Federal Agents Robert Walsh and Ralph Navarro and Detective Trainor, men were put into the warehouses as checkers, laborers, watchmen, and bookkeepers.

#### WERE WATCHED CLOSELY.

These detectives found themselves watched narrowly until they took advantage of opportunities obviously put in their way of stealing small articles, such as wrist watches and marine glasses. Not until they actually concealed these articles and pretended to steal them were they able to get any evidence against the men now in custody.

They then learned that Government property was being stolen by the truck load, including great boxes of clothing, paint by the barrel, crates of glass, and commercial alcohol by the gallon. Instances were found in which waste and salvage bought by contractors was substituted by new goods or by other merchandise than that mentioned in the contract; in other cases twice the quantity of actual salvaged stuff contracted for was delivered.

#### START OF WIDE CLEAN-UP.

It was indicated by prosecuting officials that to-day's arrests were but the start of a general clean-up involving Navy warehouse laborers, elevator operators, clerks, chauffeurs, watchmen, and packers, as well as fences, junkmen, and other accomplices on the outside.

Some of the missing material was said to have been located in warehouses in Brooklyn and Manhattan, and it was announced that the United States attorney would be asked to take steps for its recovery.

Government operators and detectives reported to Washington shortly after they began operations that heads of some of the departments in the buildings were the ring leaders in the conspiracy.

Mr. McKELLAR. I call attention to this part of it, without reading it all:

Navy intelligence officers undertook to find out the cause for the discrepancies between the inventories and the stock supposed to be on hand, but the thieves were too cunning for the regular naval detective force, the members of which were apparently well known to those who were doing the stealing.

Then it goes on to show how the Department of Justice had accomplished the discovery. It seems to me we probably had better leave these matters to the Department of Justice, and not appropriate money for the purpose of keeping up a department that seems absolutely unable to cope with the situation. If \$30,000 is the amount provided for the Office of Naval Intelligence, I take it that it is wholly inadequate to effect the purpose, and it ought to be cut out of the bill entirely, in view of this report from New York. It seems to me we had better leave it to the agents of the Department of Justice and save that much money for the people.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think the Senator has answered his own question. He just pointed out that \$30,000 was not enough money to employ detectives to guard all of the property of our Navy, with stations on both coasts. The purpose of the Office of Naval Intelligence is primarily of an entirely different character. I do not understand that the Senator from Tennessee has any objection to the use of the secret service or of the agents of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to apprehend criminals who commit crimes against the United States. That is one of the purposes for which it is organized. In fact, that is one of the purposes for which the Department of Justice was established and is maintained. The Senator says that we had better make appropriations for the Department of Justice to do this work, and that is exactly what we do, and that is why the Department of Justice investigated the matter, and apparently investigated it successfully.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then that makes it all the more imperative that this provision of the bill should be stricken out, and I will offer an amendment to strike it out, for the reason that evidently this is just one of those things which have grown up in the department which ought to be corrected, a number of employees drawing from \$1,800 to \$2,000 a year who make a plaything of this naval intelligence, and while it is their duty to prevent the very kind of theft that is mentioned in this newspaper article they did not do it. I imagine that any kind of naval intelligence that could not keep up with a theft of that sort, done almost openly and in the manner pointed out in this article, surely ought to be abolished. Let us leave the investigation of that sort of thing to one department. Why have two departments doing it? The trouble is that in these various departments we have duplication of service, and what is everybody's business is nobody's business. We ought to strike this out entirely, and ought to put the duty upon the Department of Justice to prevent such thefts from the Navy Department.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it is not necessary to go into a defense of the officers of the Naval Intelligence. I am acquainted with them. I do not know to what extent the Senator from Tennessee has personal knowledge of this office, in condemnation of which he has just spoken. My opinion is that instead of being useless men, as he describes them, men who are interested only in drawing their pay, there are no harder-working officers of the Government, no more competent or able officers, and none more successful in performing the services for which they are employed and for which their



office is established. They gather information from all parts of the world for the use of the Navy in the bearing it may have on naval activities. The Senator picks up an article in a newspaper and, without further information, apparently accepts as accurate its statements about the case to which he refers. As a lawyer, I do not think if he were put upon the responsibility of acting upon this matter he would act upon any such evidence as that, nor would he condemn an office of the Navy as he has condemned this, if he were speaking seriously and really undertaking to decide the matter, without making further investigation of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am endeavoring to make that investigation in the very place where it should be made, and in the very manner, and the only manner, in which Senators can investigate such a subject. The Senator having the bill in charge has reported a bill making a certain appropriation, and I have produced this article, which very greatly reflects upon this service of the Navy. As I understand, the Senator does not know what the facts are. We have had no report about them. There has been no answer to this article, so far as I know, and I would really like to know, before this bill is passed, whether the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy has permitted these thefts by negligence, or in what way they have been permitted.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator take the position that this little office, maintained on an appropriation of \$30,000, ought to prevent all crimes in connection with the Navy?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Or ought to prevent the commission of any theft?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; but this article said they were there, but that the thieves were too cunning for them.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator from Tennessee know that the article states the facts as they actually were?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is an Associated Press article, and by long experience we have found that the Associated Press is generally very accurate. The Associated Press would not dare to make charges against officers of the Navy which could not be substantiated, in my judgment. I believe that almost any lawyer, or any other man with good intelligence and a knowledge of the character of this institution, whether he was a lawyer or not, would say the same thing. The Associated Press is not going to print head lines like these, a significant article like this, a sensational article like this, and give it out unless there is something behind it; and it seems to me an explanation is due from the department about this enormous theft of naval material. We appropriate nearly \$300,000,000 a year for this department for all sorts of purposes. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] reminds me it is over \$300,000,000; and that is true, because there are a lot of unexpended balances reappropriated in this bill, bringing the total up to something like three and a quarter million dollars a year. Under these circumstances it does seem to me that when the Associated Press charges an office in the Government with having permitted thefts amounting to a million dollars or more, before we appropriate additional money to keep up that office there ought to be some explanation of the matter and some excuse at least given for these officers who apparently have neglected their duties.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will give the Senator an explanation. The explanation is that it is not the duty of the Office of Naval Intelligence to maintain guards at the warehouses where the property of the Navy is stored. There is no appropriation made for that purpose, and it would be utterly impossible for them to do it, even if they undertook it. Of course, the Associated Press is a great institution, and I join with the Senator in his eulogy, but even the Associated Press is very often misinformed and mistaken in what it has printed. The Senator's attention has been attracted by that, and he wants to be informed about it. It is not the business of the Office of Naval Intelligence to do what they have been charged with neglecting, but if the Senator is really looking for information, I have no doubt that the Office of Naval Intelligence or the Secretary of the Navy will be very glad indeed to give him a full report on that matter. No doubt he could have had a report on it if he had asked for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am a little surprised that the Associated Press would accuse these officers of doing something it was not their business under the law to do. The Senator from Washington says that it was not their business to look after this matter. The charge in the Associated Press dispatch is that they were actually looking after it, but were incompetent to do it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Let me correct the Senator in his quotation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I heard what the Senator said. Of course, I am perfectly willing to have him correct it or change it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator heard what I said, but he did not hear correctly, or else misquoted me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not intend to do so.

Mr. POINDEXTER. What I said was a comment on the remark of the Senator from Tennessee to the effect that these officers were charged with malfeasance or incompetence in permitting this crime to occur. I said that it was not their business to prevent the commission of crimes or to maintain guards over naval property.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is what they were charged with:

Navy intelligence officers undertook to find out the cause for the discrepancies between the inventories and the stock supposed to be on hand.

Apparently this was their business and they were executing it, carrying out, or attempting to perform, the duties of their office. Then the article goes on to say:

But the thieves were too cunning for the regular naval detective force, the members of which were apparently well known to those who were doing the stealing.

It does seem to me that this is a very grave charge against this office of the Navy, over a million dollars' worth of goods being stolen. Of course, in the Senate and in the House we appropriated money very freely, other people's money, and we forget that a million dollars amounts to anything. What is a million dollars—a little, trifling sum like a million dollars! No Senator ought to rise in his place and ask about the loss of a million dollars in a bureau of the Government! But it does seem to me that a million dollars is a considerable sum, and it is a sum about which we ought to make some inquiry. An officer of the Government is charged by the Associated Press in all the papers of the land with working on discrepancies, which afterwards turned out to be the stealing of a million dollars' worth of goods, and it does seem to me that the department should furnish a statement of the facts. If those officers have been guilty of such gross negligence, if it was their duty, as this article charges it was their duty, to prevent this very kind of theft, and they have failed in their duty, surely we should not undertake to appropriate money to keep those men in office. I hope the Senator will let this go over until to-morrow, so that we can find out something about this affair, who was to blame for it, and what steps have been taken to punish those who are responsible for it. There is no reason in the world why a million dollars' worth of goods of the Navy Department should be stolen, and where that has happened there has been wrongdoing somewhere, and it ought to be investigated by the department, and Congress ought not to appropriate additional money to keep that sort of men in office until there has been an investigation of it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I have heard nothing in the account the Senator has read which would lead me to suppose that the Office of Naval Intelligence was charged with the responsibility of guarding those stores. Those stores were stolen, and afterwards the Office of Naval Intelligence was apparently set to work to find out who committed the theft. As yet they have apparently not been successful in locating the guilty parties. They may be able to do so before they get through. Similar things happen in cases coming before the civil authorities.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then why maintain that office, if the officers are utterly unable to even ascertain that \$1,000,000 worth of goods are gone?

Mr. HALE. That happened very recently.

Mr. McKELLAR. An intelligence officer of that kind could not detect bear tracks in a snowstorm here on the Capitol Grounds. It would be impossible for him to detect anything if he could not detect the loss of \$1,000,000.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Nobody could do that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know; I think if I saw bear tracks in front of me in the snow I could tell what they were.

Mr. HALE. I think the Senator might give the department a little time to work out the problem.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am perfectly willing that this should go over until to-morrow, and I hope it will. If the officers have not been derelict in their duty, of course the criticism that is here offered is not right; but the charge standing unexplained, we ought not to appropriate any more money for an office of that kind. I have offered the amendment to-night, and I hope the Senator will let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, there is a committee amendment pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The pending amendment is, on page 13, line 21, in the total for the Naval Reserve Force and Naval Militia, to strike out "\$2,994,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,994,000."

The amendment was agreed to.



Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that all the committee amendments have been disposed of.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer the following amendment: On page 9, line 1, I move to strike out lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 9, strike out lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, as follows:

#### OFFICE OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE.

For employees in the Office of Naval Intelligence, \$30,000: *Provided*, That no person shall be employed hereunder at a rate of compensation exceeding \$1,800 per annum except two persons at \$2,000 each.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, it is now 5 o'clock and I think we had better have an executive session, as I understand it is desired to have one.

I opposed the plan of Republican leaders of keeping here during the Christmas holidays Senators who have been here all the year attending regularly the sessions of the Senate. I am not willing that some of us who have been here all day remain here any longer when others have gone home for the night. I shall suggest the absence of a quorum unless—

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will withhold that for a moment.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I thought the Senator suggested having an executive session?

Mr. HEFLIN. If the Senator from Washington is ready to go into executive session and end the legislative session now I shall withhold the point of no quorum. You forced us to remain here during Christmas and you have got to have a quorum to transact business.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously made, until to-morrow, Thursday, December 28, 1922, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate December 27, 1922.*

##### UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

Passed Asst. Surgeon Julian M. Gillespie to be surgeon in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from December 30, 1921. This officer has served the required time in his present grade and has passed the necessary examination required by law.

##### UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

The following-named officers of the Department of Commerce to occupy the positions held by them under recess appointments:

Aaron George Katz, of New York, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with relative rank of lieutenant in the Navy.

Charles Mitchell Thomas, of Virginia, to be aid, with relative rank of ensign in the Navy.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY.

###### VETERINARY CORPS.

*To be first lieutenant.*

Second Lieut. Ralph Henry Lewis, from December 13, 1922.

###### CHAPLAINS.

*To be chaplains with the rank of captain.*

Chaplain Emil William Weber, from October 5, 1922.

Chaplain John Oscar Lindquist, from October 10, 1922.

Chaplain Alexander Wayman Thomas, from October 19, 1922.

Chaplain Frank Connors Rideout, from October 23, 1922.

Chaplain Alfred Cookman Oliver, jr., from October 24, 1922.

Chaplain Pierre Hector Levesque, from November 7, 1922.

Chaplain John Hall, from November 16, 1922.

Chaplain Edward Lewis Trett, from November 27, 1922.

Chaplain Charles Coburn Merrill, from November 28, 1922.

##### PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

###### MARINE CORPS.

Col. Rufus H. Lane, assistant adjutant and inspector, to be the adjutant and inspector of the Marine Corps, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of four years from the 2d day of January, 1923.

Lieut. Col. Henry C. Davis to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of January, 1923.

Luther A. Brown, a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for a probationary period of two years, from the 20th day of December, 1922.

##### POSTMASTERS.

###### ARIZONA.

Carrie B. Yett to be postmaster at Safford, Ariz., in place of E. M. Dial. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

###### ARKANSAS.

Monroe J. Gogue to be postmaster at Rector, Ark., in place of C. M. Cox, resigned.

###### CALIFORNIA.

Elizabeth Tyler to be postmaster at Randsburg, Calif., in place of Josephine Montgomery, resigned.

###### CONNECTICUT.

William J. Reel to be postmaster at Canaan, Conn., in place of E. L. Roberts. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Carrie A. Bush to be postmaster at Watertown, Conn., in place of E. P. McGowan. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

###### GEORGIA.

Andrew H. Stapler to be postmaster at Metter, Ga., in place of A. H. Staples, to correct name.

###### ILLINOIS.

Jesse E. Miller to be postmaster at Cairo, Ill., in place of Bernard McManus, jr. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

Walter H. Sass to be postmaster at Monee, Ill., in place of R. M. Freese. Office became third class April 1, 1922.

William W. Renton to be postmaster at Wheaton, Ill., in place of W. V. Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

###### INDIANA.

Willard G. Minard to be postmaster at Bourbon, Ind., in place of J. N. Wolf. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Lester L. Wildman to be postmaster at Dupont, Ind., in place of G. A. Wilhelm, resigned.

Phineas O. Small to be postmaster at Laporte, Ind., in place of J. A. Terry. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Odin R. Smith to be postmaster at Martinsville, Ind., in place of Lewis Sartor. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

James S. Wright to be postmaster at Vevay, Ind., in place of E. F. Griffith. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

###### IOWA.

William G. Wood to be postmaster at Alvia, Iowa, in place of J. M. Gass. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Elmer G. Warrington to be postmaster at Keota, Iowa, in place of G. H. Helscher. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Raymond S. Blair to be postmaster at Parkersburg, Iowa, in place of J. R. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Gabriel L. Archer to be postmaster at St. Charles, Iowa, in place of H. R. Hurlbut. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

###### MASSACHUSETTS.

John B. Rose to be postmaster at Chester, Mass., in place of J. J. Harrington. Incumbent's commission expired October 1, 1922.

###### MINNESOTA.

Nellie M. Watkins to be postmaster at Clinton, Minn., in place of F. W. Watkins. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

Gunhild Sollom to be postmaster at Holt, Minn., in place of Racine Olson, declined.

Carl A. Ecklund to be postmaster at Marine on St. Croix, Minn., in place of C. A. Ecklund. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Norman Hanson to be postmaster at Renville, Minn., in place of W. L. Poseley. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

###### NEW JERSEY.

George R. Truex to be postmaster at Red Bank, N. J., in place of Frank Pittenger. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.



## NEW YORK.

Wade E. Gayer to be postmaster at Fulton, N. Y., in place of P. T. Conley. Incumbent's commission expired September 28, 1922.

Samuel W. Berry to be postmaster at Maybrook, N. Y., in place of G. M. Pierson. Incumbent's commission expired November 21, 1922.

Lewis E. Elston to be postmaster at Unionville, N. Y., in place of L. E. Elston. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

## NORTH CAROLINA.

John W. Kelly to be postmaster at Jonesboro, N. C., in place of B. R. Avent. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

## OHIO.

Edward C. Anderson to be postmaster at Blanchester, Ohio, in place of M. A. Baldwin. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

George H. Lewis to be postmaster at Geneva, Ohio, in place of W. M. Carpenter. Incumbent's commission expired September 19, 1922.

## OKLAHOMA.

Robert B. Morford to be postmaster at Lawton, Okla., in place of Robert Landers. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1922.

## PENNSYLVANIA.

Frank H. Keth to be postmaster at Summerville, Pa., in place of J. E. Guthrie, resigned.

## SOUTH CAROLINA.

Virginia M. Bodie to be postmaster at Wagener, S. C., in place of Virginia Gantt. Incumbent's commission expired October 24, 1922.

## TENNESSEE.

William M. Brewer to be postmaster at Collinwood, Tenn., in place of S. E. Byler, deceased.

Alvin M. Stout to be postmaster at Greenfield, Tenn., in place of P. D. Harris. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

## TEXAS.

William M. Bowen to be postmaster at Beckville, Tex., in place of J. W. Sharp. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Minnie L. Landon to be postmaster at Burnet, Tex., in place of L. S. Chamberlain, jr. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

Hugh W. Cunningham to be postmaster at Ellasville, Tex., in place of E. J. Smith, removed.

Lee Hood to be postmaster at Justin, Tex., in place of W. A. Leuty, removed.

Willie O. Brents to be postmaster at Whitewright, Tex., in place of H. L. Webster, removed.

## UTAH.

Lydia R. Shaw to be postmaster at Huntington, Utah, in place of A. M. Truman. Office became third class October 1, 1920.

## VIRGINIA.

William H. Ruebush to be postmaster at Dayton, Va., in place of C. A. Funkhouser. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

S. Clyde Bliss to be postmaster at Farmville, Va., in place of J. L. Hart, deceased.

Thomas P. Farrar to be postmaster at Ivy Depot, Va., in place of H. G. White. Office became third class January 1, 1921.

Emmett W. Brittle to be postmaster at Wakefield, Va., in place of L. E. Stephenson. Incumbent's commission expired September 13, 1922.

## WYOMING.

Percy G. Matthews to be postmaster at Evanston, Wyo., in place of J. H. Cameron. Incumbent's commission expired September 5, 1922.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 27, 1922.*

## POSTMASTERS.

## CALIFORNIA.

Harry W. Haskell, Indio.

Lewis P. Hathaway, Ventura.

## MINNESOTA.

Edwin Mattson, Breckenridge.  
Carl G. Hertig, Buffalo Lake.  
John S. Stensrud, Canby.  
Herman C. Rustad, Kerkhoven.  
Arthur C. Omholt, Sacred Heart.  
Everett R. Vitalis, Shafer.  
Einar S. Rydberg, Spooner.

## NEBRASKA.

James J. McCarthy, Greeley.  
Edward E. Ely, Milford.  
Elmer G. Watkins, Orleans.  
Chester C. Alden, Whitman.

## OREGON.

Flora A. Fowler, Goble.  
Lawrence S. McConnell, Sherwood.  
Mart Griffin, Umatilla.

## SOUTH DAKOTA.

Frank D. Beste, Corsica.  
Benny P. Humphreys, Reliance.  
Jacob L. Bergstreser, Willow Lake.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, December 27, 1922.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of life and light, of time and eternity, the world is Thine and Thou art near. We have only to wait to hear Thy voice and to feel Thy presence. We thank Thee that we are not the victims of chance and fate, but we live in Thy life and move in Thy strength. With us may the happiness and comfort of all be the object of each. As Thou art above all and over all, so help us to think, to feel, and to speak with good will toward all and hate for none. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, December 23, 1922, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 4172) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Great Pee Dee River, in South Carolina, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

## INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider H. R. 13559, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate on the bill be limited to an hour and a half, three-quarters of an hour on each side, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and one-half by myself.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have requests for about an hour on this side.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I modify my request and ask for two hours of general debate, of which one-half is to be controlled by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill; and pending that motion he asks unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to two hours, half to be controlled by himself and half by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13559) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending



June 30, 1924, and for other purposes, with Mr. TOWNER in the chair.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in the old days at Rome every legislative proposal in the forum, every new religion brought in by strangers, every new idea of any kind, had to meet the test, "Cui bono," "What is the good of it?"

It seems to me that such a question should be put to congressional appropriations now as never before. The people of America are bending under the most grievous burden of taxation ever laid in any nation. Every dollar in taxes levied under such circumstances should mean as nearly as possible a hundred contribution to the general welfare.

This bill contains an appropriation of \$13,312,805 for the maintenance of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Very few persons, in or out of Congress, realize what a colossal sum that is, compared with the expenditures for other governmental activities.

The entire Department of State, with its bureaus, divisions, and world-wide activities, costs the taxpayers of America less than the Indian Bureau.

That is, we can pay for the Secretary of State, his assistants, and all the clerks needed for the conduct of this great executive department; we can pay the salaries of all our ambassadors and ministers, secretaries and clerks and interpreters at embassies and legations, United States consuls, vice consuls, and other helpers; we can pay for the transportation of all our Diplomatic and Consular officers, for the rent of all our embassy, legation, and consular buildings and grounds; we can pay the expenses of carrying out all our international obligations and commissions, such as the Pan American Union; we can pay all these expenses in connection with our official intercourse with all the world and still have \$4,000,000 left, compared to the cost of maintaining the Indian Bureau and its activities which have grown like the fabulous bean stalk.

The entire judicial system of the United States, including the Supreme Court, circuit court of appeals, district courts, Hawaiian and Porto Rican courts, courts of customs appeals, courts of claims, Territorial courts, with all their United States marshals and deputies, their United States attorneys and assistants, their clerks and commissioners, and all other expenses, amount to \$11,790,700. The Indian Bureau is to cost next year more than \$13,000,000.

This Bureau of Indian Affairs, which 50 years ago was declared to be only a temporary activity, will next year spend about as much as the entire Customs Service, which brings \$400,000,000 into the Treasury. It will cost the taxpayers about the same as the entire Coast Guard, about whose wonderful work we have heard so much recently. It will spend millions more than the entire Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which issues all the currency and securities of the United States. It will cost millions more than the entire Public Health Service, with all the far-flung activities dealing with the health of all Americans.

Think of the Department of Labor. It has a Bureau of Immigration which administers our laws relative to all immigrants. It has a Bureau of Naturalization which must look after the admission of all aliens into American citizenship. Under that department is the Children's Bureau, the Women's Bureau, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. But for all these great activities, together with all salaries, rents, and all other expenses, the cost is but \$6,618,556, while the Indian Bureau alone takes eleven millions out of the Treasury this year, besides the tribal funds of the Indians.

We finance the entire Department of Commerce, with the exception of the Bureau of Lighthouses, for less than the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We have had many efforts to economize here and there in the Department of Commerce by cutting down appropriations a few thousands. Is it not time to realize that the millions of dollars involved in the handling of Indian affairs are worthy of our attention?

Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask, "Cui bono"—what is the good of it?

First, what benefit comes to the American people from the expenditure of this thirteen millions?

It is spent to enable more than 5,000 Government employees to supervise and superintend less than 50,000 Indian families. It assigns a Government agent to every 10 families for 1923, as has been the case for many years. The public pays the bill.

Shall we say that the benefit comes to the American public in protection against the bloody menace of Indian wars? I will admit that thirteen millions is not too much to pay for a year's security against the scalping knife and tomahawk. If there were deadly danger that the Crows and the Blackfeet, who refused to shed the blood of the white men, even while they were being robbed of their hunting grounds, might descend upon Chicago and ravage the Windy City with knife and fire, the money would be well spent. If the Sioux and the Apaches, instead of being decimated by tuberculosis and trachoma, were threatening to go on the warpath against Omaha and St. Louis, the expenditure of thirteen millions would be amply justified.

But the difficulty is that no advocate of the costly system of Indian Bureau control will say that this great sum is necessary to protect the American people against the Indians. They admit that we must send the taxgatherers out to collect these millions from the earnings of the people and then pay it out largely to nonproducers and Government functionaries, but they do not argue that there is any benefit in return to the taxpayers, who produce it.

No, Mr. Chairman; they say that America must sacrifice many millions in tax money for the benefit of the Indians. These 50,000 families must be protected and guarded. One agent must be allotted to every 10 families, not to help the American taxpayers but to help the Indians.

That, then, is the crux of the matter. The whole case of the Indian Bureau is based on the assumption that it benefits the Indians to the extent of the \$13,000,000 contributed by the American people.

If it be shown that no such benefit comes to the Indians through the bureau the case falls. But if it be shown that the expenditure of the millions taken out of the pockets of the American public in fact works an injury on the Indians themselves, then the appropriation of further funds is infamous.

Mr. Chairman, I deny that this \$13,000,000 appropriation benefits the Indians. I propose to prove to the satisfaction of any person, save one who profits from the present bureau system, that it injures them. I believe that the Indian would be better off to-day if the Indian Bureau had been abolished 25 years ago.

Here are 300,000 human beings of a race which for 90 years has been under complete control of the Indian Bureau. During that time they have been forcibly driven off their home lands of the Eastern States and herded into reservations west of the Mississippi. These reservations, whose bounds were laid out in sacred treaties, have been cut in two oftentimes without a word to the Indians concerned. Not a treaty made by the United States Government with the Indians has been kept and these acts of faithlessness have either been initiated or approved by the Indian Bureau, this great protector of a helpless people.

But let us forget that black, hideous page of our history. These reservations, diminished even as they have been, have become very valuable. The building up of the West and the increase of population have added to the value of every acre. On some reservations great oil deposits have been discovered and minerals of various kinds have been found. There are valuable forests on others.

Not because of the Indian Bureau but because of the national growth of America and in spite of the Indian Bureau the lands still left to the Indians became valuable.

In all, the 50,000 families under the control of the Indian Bureau have lands and other property worth a billion dollars to-day.

That means for every Indian family wealth of \$15,000 and more. It means an average income of \$900 for every family, which is more than the average income for all the families of the United States.

These Indians are possessors of wealth, but they are starving for lack of the necessities of life. Does it benefit the Indian to lock up his own possessions in order to keep him forever dangling to a pauperizing, degrading bureau system? Does it benefit the Indian to have bureau agents dissipate his property while they spend millions in tax funds as well?

Listen to James McLaughlin, for 50 years an American official dealing with the Indian problem. He has been superintendent of Indian agencies and Indian inspectors, and I have heard him given credit for knowing more about the Indians than any man in the United States. In his book, *My Friend the Indian*, he gives actual facts to prove that the expenditure of these millions does not benefit the Indian. He says:

The fund belonging to the Indians held in the Treasury of the United States might be described as an endowment for the creation of paupers and the perpetuation of the present state of dependence among the people to whose credit it stands.



It appears to me that it is the duty of the Government to make some provision presently for the emancipation of these unhappy victims, to deliver them from the evils that guarantee a future of ungentle pauperism, by giving to the Indian his portion and turning him adrift to work out his own salvation.

Mr. Chairman, Major McLaughlin made that declaration of policy in 1910. In the 12 years succeeding, instead of taking any steps to free the Indians, we have bound them in countless new schemes and toils, bringing them more surely under the system which he so deplored.

This enlightened man declares that the Indians to-day are not as desirable a class of people as they were 40 years ago.

Why is this true? Let Major McLaughlin answer:

The Indian was in turns browbeaten and cajoled, bribed and punished, threatened and rewarded, and all the worst elements in his character developed for want of firm, consistent, and honest treatment.

He describes in detail the condition of a South Dakota tribe of Indians which for many years lived on its own resources and which conquered its difficulties. Then came tribal funds through sales of lands and the consequent control of the Indian Bureau.

I have no hesitancy in saying that the conditions of these Indians to-day is not as hopeful as it was when they had no wealth in expectancy and no payments to depend upon—

Says Major McLaughlin.

Their advancement has been greatly retarded by the system under which they live. Fifteen years of annuity drawing has made of a people that was struggling to the surface by personal effort a set of paupers in chancery. They would be better off, as far as the future is concerned, if they stood as blanketed Indians on the virgin prairie.

Major McLaughlin draws a vivid picture of this particular tribe and then states:

I instance this band as a sample of what has been accomplished by governmental administration of Indian funds. They prove incontrovertibly the demoralizing effect of the present system and they stand as a fair sample of people treated as they have been. The Indian who has nothing at all, either at present or in expectancy, is much better off and infinitely better material upon which to work.

Fifty years of study and observation and experience have brought Major McLaughlin to one conclusion:

Give the Indians the money they have coming. Give it to them as soon as possible. Do away with the leading strings and check rein by which the Indian is how so handicapped, and he will immediately feel the necessity for demonstrating his capacity to manage his own estate. By this means only can the Indian be saved from chronic indigence and ultimate and absolute pauperism. I am sufficiently well acquainted with Indian nature to venture the prophesy that a large majority of those under 50 years of age will develop the capacity to hustle for themselves exactly in the proportion that their needs press them. Take away his annuity by letting him handle the principal, and the Indian will be given a start on the road to complete civilization and independence that will land him at the desired goal in nine cases out of ten.

That is advice this Congress would do well to follow. Every added dollar of appropriation works an injury to the Indians.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is loudly declared that these great appropriations must continue because it would be cruel and brutal to reverse our policy of 90 years. These self-styled friends of the Indians cry out that the Indians do not want freedom and its responsibilities. "Oh, no," they exclaim, "The Indians are begging to be allowed to remain under the sheltering wings of the Indian Bureau."

It has cost millions of American dollars to build up that falsehood and foist it upon the American people. The officials of the Indian Bureau know that statement is not true. They know the tricks and schemes and foxlike watchfulness necessary to give it even a semblance of reality. They fight to death any plan to settle the question by fair vote. They oppose any election which would show that the wings of the bureau give shelter to the Indians just as the hawk's wings shelter the partridge.

The best plan yet devised by the mind of man for ascertaining the will of a large body of men and women is through the direct election of representatives. Upon that principle is built our system of representative democracy.

The desires of the American Indians, wherever a free opportunity is given, have been shown to favor freedom and to oppose bureaucratic control. This fact is so well known to the Indian Bureau that it has for years arrogated to itself the right to supervise and control the election of council members and tribal delegates.

The superintendent of the reservation must put his seal of approval on the Indians who vote. He must approve the delegates elected. He assumes the right to fill all vacancies. As a final quencher of free representation, the Washington office exercises the right of recognizing only such delegates as it desires.

Is any man so foolish as to believe that an honest expression of opinion can be secured under such duress. Every Member of Congress has had experience enough in things political to know that if his political enemies had the right to scan the voting

lists and select the voters he would have little chance of representing his constituency here or anywhere else.

If an Indian has shown any activity against the bureau system of control, he may have the support of a vast majority of the members of his tribe, but that means nothing if the superintendent says "Nay." It would take volumes to record the schemes which have been used to overthrow the will of the majority and substitute the will of a minority. Rump conventions, meetings of the few faithful, without notice to any others, refusal to authorize traveling expenses; they are many and devious, but are effective in smothering the desires of the Indians. It is brutal business, but necessary if the bureau is to endure.

The Flathead Indians had a council in 1921 which represented them. They selected Max J. Barnaby and Mary Lemery to come to Washington to correct certain abuses in administration.

The bureau could not deny the election, but nullified it by officially declaring that the business committee of the Flatheads was the real tribal council. Since the superintendent had named members of the business committee, he felt justified in making it the official body representing the Indians.

The two regularly elected delegates came to Washington with their credentials. They were not recognized by the bureau, and when Senator THOMAS J. WALSH took up the question of the payment of expenses from Indian funds he received this answer:

The council from which Miss Lemery and Mr. Barnaby claimed authority to come to Washington was not an official tribal council of the Flathead Tribe, and both are familiar with the order against coming to Washington at the expense of the tribe without procuring authority in advance.

It was not an official council because it was not completely under the control of the bureau officials. "Authority in advance" is only given those who represent the bureau rather than the Indians.

Mr. Chairman, if the Indian Bureau believed that the Indians are so devoted to their kindly control, would they stoop to such methods? The fact is that the bureau knows that a fair and free expression of the will of the Indians would show such an overwhelming majority in favor of freedom that it would end forever the expensive legend that these original Americans are hugging their fetters in ecstasy.

Oh, no, the bureau does not allow them to elect their delegates freely, nor can the Indians even select their own attorneys.

The Indians have interest which forever will conflict with the interest of the Indian Bureau. They might as well be unrepresented as to have an attorney whose only chance of employment lies in the approval of the bureau. It is a fraud and mockery to talk of representation under such circumstances.

These are not all the powers and the plots used to silence the Indians. Officials on the reservation and in Washington promise special favors for the silence of leaders who have voiced complaints. It is very easy to throw money and position in the way of the man who is a potential trouble maker for the bureau. Many have been tempted and some have fallen, but it is well to record for the sake of human nature that the great majority have spurned the bureau bribe and have refused to sell out their fellows for individual gain. "Divide and conquer" was the advice of the Hapsburgs to every holder of unjust power. It is the policy of the Indian Bureau.

The Flatheads are set against the Blackfeet, the Sioux against the Crows, and so forth. Although organization on nation-wide scale is the very key to modern development, it has never been permitted to get foothold among the Indians.

When the Pueblo delegation came to Washington and requested James J. Coffey, a Chippewa, to accompany them to the Indian Office for conference, they were soon given to understand the heinous crime they had committed. When Coffey tried to speak for them he was silenced. Assistant Commissioner Meritt said to the Pueblos:

We would be glad to consider anything you want done to help, but we want you to do it yourselves and not get anyone from any other reservation to help you.

Mr. Chairman, when any volunteer organization, like the Society of American Indians, undertakes to secure the cooperation of all the Indians in their common cause, it is made the target of unlimited abuse. Its members are denounced as agitators and the Star-Spangled Banner is called into use to drape over a most un-American institution. The Indians are forbidden by the bureau to form any kind of organization looking to their emancipation. They can not make a donation to Indians who have left the reservations and are eager to help their brothers escape.

This attempt to prostitute high American ideals into use against those who stand for American equality and square deal is disheartening evidence of the fact that "patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel."

Mr. Chairman, do you not understand how this system I have outlined tends to prevent expression on the part of the



Indians? Do you not see the net in which they are held? Do you not realize that the great cry of protest which is coming from these reservations is in itself proof of heroism and bravery worthy of noble men and women?

Let any white man go to one of these reservations and tell the Indians that all men are created equal and have inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Let him tell the Indians that they should be freed from bureaucratic control and compelled to obey laws of State and Nation as Americans.

That is high treason. Such heresies threaten the very ark of the covenant. There is an Indian Bureau official to stamp out these infamous doctrines. Back of that autocrat is a jail and police, and back of all stands the entire Government of the United States. Out goes this dangerous disturber of the peace—of the bureau.

If that be the fate of a white American citizen, what must be the abject helplessness of the uneducated, isolated Indian, and what must be his heroism when he dares fight on against such overwhelming odds?

It is an Indian saying that courage is the noblest quality of the heart. They lived by that motto when they faced overpowering foes unafraid. But no Indian attacked by savage beast or savage man ever exhibited greater bravery than those Indians who have dared to assail the Indian Bureau system of control.

Remember, he can be thrown into jail on the simple complaint of a bureau official. Remember, he can be tried and sentenced without jury or evidence. He can not have an attorney to defend him without the consent of those who are prosecuting him. His money, his property, and his means of livelihood are in the hands of the prosecutor.

Gentlemen of the committee, to fight in such an unequal battle as that requires a man. Fifty years of that oppression would crush the spirit out of any people that did not have inherent qualities of nobility and self-respect. Yet there are thousands of red men whose heads are bloody but unbowed. They have triumphed over the degeneracy and decay which accompany the segregated reservation system. The bureau has put them in prison but has not had power to chain their spirit. They have beaten down ignorance and idleness. They have retained not only their fleetness of foot and keenness of vision but also their qualities of endurance and high courage. They have the confidence of their people, who are eager to follow in their footsteps once the burdens are taken from their backs.

They are entitled to a fair chance, and I propose to do anything in my power to see that they get it. They have a right to have America know that the great sums spent by the Indian Office are not for the benefit of the Indian.

Mr. Chairman, the present system is wrong. In a day which has seen the crashing down of kaisers and czars, the Indian Bureau is a despot out of date. It is "fruit left too late, high on a blighted bough, ripe till it's rotten."

To live at the whim of bureau officials is the last and worst misery that human beings can feel. It is calculated to convert men into creatures without ambition, because without hope. I have heard an old Indian say, "Our grandfathers died in slavery; our fathers died in slavery; we may die in slavery, and our children may die in slavery, but something will come of it at last."

Something will come of it now if Congress has Americanism enough in its make-up. It is high time to reverse the maxim of bureaucracy, "The Indian is made for the bureau and not the bureau for the Indian."

Mr. Chairman, this is not the only bureau in American history which has undertaken to guide every detail of the lives of helpless human beings.

The Freedmen's Bureau was established in 1865 in order to do for the negroes exactly what the Indian Bureau is supposed to do for the Indians. Its record of maladministration has been outdone by the Indian Bureau and its abolition by Congress should be followed by similar action as to the Indian Bureau.

After Appomattox there were 4,880,000 negroes who were neither slaves nor citizens. They were dubbed "wards of the Nation," just as the American Indians are to-day.

The Freedmen's Bureau was given sovereign powers in dealing with these negroes. It undertook to regulate life, morals, and conduct. It had charge of every labor contract entered into by a negro. It had final authority over the sale, leasing, and cultivation of abandoned and confiscated lands in the South. It distributed rations, medicines, clothing, and other supplies. It looked after the transportation of all freedmen and bureau officials. It had power to provide for all educational facilities and to look after the savings of the freedmen.

In short, it had the same powers as the Indian Bureau to-day. It was a government within itself, legislative, judicial, and executive. It was independent of and superior to the civil governments in the various States. It established its own courts and supervised the action of the State courts.

The bureau was established as a temporary agency and was to go out of existence one year from the conclusion of the war. In 1866 it was extended for two years more, and later was extended to June 20, 1872, when it was finally abolished.

Its commissioner was Gen. O. O. Howard, one of the finest gentlemen and bravest soldiers in American history. In spite of that fact the Freedmen's Bureau made a record for corruption and debauchery which has shamed American annals.

It was organized to benefit the negroes. What was the result? History records that the ministrations of the bureau resulted in harsh treatment of the negroes, disease, pauperism, and death.

The freedmen were exploited by a horde of incompetent and unscrupulous officeholders. These deluded victims were told that they were to be given "40 acres and a mule" upon payment of a small sum. Agents sold the negroes red, white, and blue sticks and told them they could stake out their 40 acres wherever they desired.

In the public archives there is a deed for land which was handed over with these red, white, and blue sticks. It was headed "Office, Bureau of Freedmen," and was as follows:

Know all men by these presents that a naught is a naught and a figure is a figure: all for the white man and none for the nigger. And whereas Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so also have I lifted this nigger out of four dollars and six bits. Amen, Selah, Nix Cum Rouse. (Seal.)

Then there was organized the Freedman's Savings & Trust Co., whose founder was John W. Alvord, superintendent of the educational work of the Freedmen's Bureau. Although it was a private corporation chartered by Congress, the negroes were told that it was a Government institution. A picture of Abraham Lincoln adorned the cover of the bank books used, and there was also an official statement that it was an auxiliary to the Freedmen's Bureau.

The negroes were swindled by those who were appointed to guard and protect them. The bank failed in 1874, owing \$3,299,201 to the deluded and helpless depositors, and although many bills have been introduced to reimburse them not a cent has ever been returned to the victims.

The bureau, like every bureaucracy dealing with helpless peoples, puts its hands into everything and corrupted everything. It started many schools and spent \$5,262,511.26 for education, and yet never had one-tenth of the negro children in school. It issued more than 15,000,000 rations, at a cost of \$3,000,000, which resulted, according to Walter H. Fleming, of the West Virginia University, in "the negroes crowding into the towns, where much suffering and disease resulted."

It established hospitals, camps, dispensaries, and communities at a cost of millions, and every one proved a failure. In all, the total expenditures in about seven years were reported as \$13,359,065.58 out of the United States Treasury. Many more millions were contributed by charitable organizations and were spent by the bureau.

Such expenditures were regarded as ruinous, and finally the bureau was abolished, in spite of tremendous pressure from officeholders, who prophesied the destruction of the Republic if their bloodsucking institution should be touched with impious hands.

It was a wise act to stop its operations. If it had grown as has the Indian Bureau, dealing with millions of people instead of thousands, its expenditures to-day would require the total receipts of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, the Indian Bureau deals with some 300,000 persons. Yet in one year it spends more money than the Freedmen's Bureau in its entire history, dealing with fifteen times as many persons.

The negroes to-day, thrown upon their own resources and forced to sink or swim, have made giant strides toward self-reliance and self-support, compared to the Indians. The Indians have been herded into reservations, ground down by regulations issued by petty officeholders. Practically the Indians belong to the Indian Bureau, as Legree said of Uncle Tom, "body and soul."

"Poorer every year," sighs the Indian; and it is true, in spite of the fact that the wealth of Indian provinces has been spent by the bureau.

These appropriations benefit the Indians? You will never say so when you study the history of any of these tribes and know the audacious injustices perpetrated upon them down the years.



Let us take the Blackfeet Indians, for example. In 1855 the United States negotiated a treaty with the Blackfeet formally recognizing their ownership of a great tract of plains and mountains bounded on the north by the Canadian line, on the west by the summit of the Rockies, and on the south by the Musselshell River and the Missouri to the mouth of the Milk River, and on the east from the mouth of the Milk River north to the Canadian line.

That territory was to be the home and hunting grounds of these Indians. But in 1867 an Executive order fixed the southern boundary on the Missouri River. Other Executive orders took away half the land left. The Indians were never consulted about this diminishing of their reservations. In fact, the first they even knew about it was when United States soldiers rounded them up in their buffalo grounds and drove them north.

The Indian Bureau was to furnish them food supplies, but in the winter of 1883, 500 Blackfeet died of starvation because there was no provision made for them.

Then, in 1887, the United States besought the Indians to sell a great tract in the eastern part of the reservation. Finally they yielded, and for the sum of \$1,500,000 they parted with their heritage. Once more, in 1896, representatives of the Government came to them and persuaded them to sell the western part of their reservation, the region which is now Glacier National Park, for another \$1,500,000.

The money received was placed in the Treasury. All of it, and a great sum besides, has been spent by the Indian Bureau for the alleged benefit of these duped and deluded Americans.

The tribe has been decimated by disease and starvation, and for more than a generation they have suffered misery which could come only to serfs despised and neglected by their masters.

In 1915 United States Senator Harry Lane, of Oregon, made a personal inspection of the reservation and reported to the Joint Commission to Investigate Indian Affairs. Here is what he said:

The condition of the full-blooded Indians in this district, many of whose homes I visited, was pitiable. I found families consisting of as many as six or eight persons living in single-room shacks, and in some instances the beds were made down with insufficient bedding; such bedding as they did have frequently consisted of old rags and sacks or scraps of coverlets. This condition is bad for them and will result eventually in their entire destruction, no doubt, for the reason that if one member of the family becomes infected with tuberculosis or trachoma or any other contagious disease, every condition is favorable for the disease to spread to all the members of the family and to other visiting Indians.

There is no game in this country, or at least not enough to afford them subsistence. I was informed that to keep from starving they had killed and eaten all the prairie dogs and also had resorted to eating skunks.

They are unable to protect themselves from acts of injustice done them, and are thus deprived of any remedy for their relief, and have been left to rot through the incompetence or willful neglect of those in charge of them and their affairs. Indeed, it has heretofore and is now said to be unsafe for anyone who can be "reached" to present their claims or complaints to Congress. It is "cords to the wrists and gages to the heels" for anyone who undertakes the thankless task, and such persons are pursued and harassed, and the sole effort which is afterwards made seems to be to cover up the evidence and put upon trial the complaining witness in place of trying to remedy the evil or punish those guilty of wrongdoing.

While upon the reservation I had experience with these tactics. I was informed by some of the Indians who had talked with me that the police of the agency had warned them against doing it, and had threatened to arrest some of them for attending illegal meetings. Right foxy and well able to take care of themselves are the gentry who are responsible for the gross mismanagement of the Blackfeet and other Indians.

If the condition of the Blackfeet Indians at this time is to be taken as an index of the character of the trusteeship which the Government imposes upon other Indians, the work has been a failure. The spectacle is a depressing one and calls not only for immediate relief but for an entire and permanent change in the manner of handling their affairs.

Senator Lane made his investigation and his scathing criticisms more than seven years ago. Not one inch advance has been made in that time toward better conditions. Every year since the Indian Bureau, under color of devotion to the Indians' welfare, has fastened tighter its strangle hold upon the Indians for its own selfish and sinister purposes.

Under date of September 28, 1922, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in response to my request, gave me a statement as to the financial condition of the Blackfeet Indians.

He stated that there is \$54,196.26 in the United States Treasury to the credit of the tribe. The receipts from grazing leases were \$32,586.20 in 1917, but they dropped to \$1,503.54 in 1922.

In the meantime the appropriations from the Treasury for the support and civilization of these Indians increased from \$24,681.94 in 1917 to \$59,348.33 in 1922.

The commissioner reports that the bureau placed a tribal herd on the reservation on the reimbursable plan. The total cost of the herd was \$367,053.46. Of this amount \$61,957.84 was paid out for salaries and wages to bureau employees.

It is stated that the herd was sold at a net loss of \$54,523, not counting equipment. The loss on this one venture is more

than the entire amount to the credit of the tribe in the Treasury.

The whole scheme of tribal herds and communistic property is a bureau scheme to prevent the Indians becoming Americans. It is entirely wrong in principle, even though it should be successful as a dollar and cents proposition. But what shall we say when, after investing the money of the Indians without their knowledge or consent, the bureau loses the money invested and beggars the Indians?

Remember that the main argument of the bureau officials for the continuance of their bureaucracy is the business incapacity of their ward. How did they demonstrate their efficiency?

There came a drought in the Blackfeet country and the grass failed. The supervisor in charge ordered the cattle turned into the allotments of Indians who had been endeavoring to make their own livelihoods on their lands. Even the little hay that they had toiled to secure was eaten by the tribal herds.

Then the supervisor became panic stricken and ordered that the cattle must be shipped out at once. They had to be dipped before they could be shipped and this was ordered done in severe winter weather. The cattlemen dipped their cattle in the summer time, but this tribal herd, the property of the Indians, was dipped when the thermometer was 30 degrees below zero. These cattle were crowded into a liquid bath which covered them completely and then came out of it to freeze to death.

Some of them died at once, others died on the railroad cars, but there was no recourse. The guardianship of the Indian Bureau had been exemplified once more. It was but one more illustration of the value of a system which puts the Indians, their lives and lands, their money and morals, in the hands of the Indian Bureau.

I have been told by members of the Blackfeet Tribe that the cattle of this tribal herd were branded with the same brand used by a Montana stockman. Little wonder that five or six hundred head of cattle disappeared from the reservation and that no effort was made to recover them. Fish Wolf Robe is a Blackfeet who had an allotment upon which he worked faithfully in an effort to put up enough hay to provide the necessities of life. He had about 20 tons cured when the agency employees ran the tribal herd into his meadows. The cattle ate up his hay and left him destitute. When he complained he was threatened with jail. He was told that the official had leased his land for the use of the tribal herd.

He had never desired to lease his land and never received any money for a lease. But what mattered these little details when he was an Indian, who must be guarded and protected against himself?

Mr. Chairman, the whole system is intolerable enough to "stir a fever in the blood of age and make infant sinew strong as steel."

Do you realize that this losing venture of a tribal herd stands as a mortgage against the property of the Indians? Those cattle were bought with reimbursable funds. Even the Indians whose individual holdings were ravaged by the herd are held responsible for their due share of the losses. The Indians were not consulted, but they are expected to pay. They did not have a voice in the arrangement, but they must meet the bureau invoice of losses.

Still this tragedy of errors in regard to the tribal herd which dissipated every dollar of their tribal funds is not the greatest calamity endured by the Blackfeet.

The tribal herd has run its course over the reservation and has done its damage. The losses have been stopped.

A far greater liability is the irrigation system which has been fastened upon this reservation in violation of every vestige of common sense. The commissioner in his letter to me states that since 1910 \$1,095,251.15 has been spent for irrigation on this reservation. In the last fiscal year the amount was \$31,299.77. This great sum has been spent, not with the approval of the Indians whose property is mortgaged to pay for it, but over their protests.

Not even the bureau can defend the policy now. Assistant Commissioner Meritt testified before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee dealing with the Interior Department bill of 1923. He said:

This irrigation project has not proven successful in the past because of climatic conditions. They sometimes have frosts in May and snows in August.

Of course, the Indian Bureau only learned this habit of nature after a million dollars had been spent. For uncounted ages this territory in the Rockies, stretching to the Canadian border, has had killing frosts in the summer time. The Indians knew it, but, of course, they are incompetent, and must not be encouraged to offer advice to their masters.



There are 47,600 acres in that irrigation project already under irrigation. Only 2,005 acres have ever been cultivated by Indians. It cost for operation and maintenance last year \$27,666 in order that a few incurably optimistic Indians might attempt to grow crops under such conditions—\$14 an acre in costs—and the Indians secured only a small fraction of that in crops.

Could there be a more flagrant instance of the willful waste of money than that? Could the poor Indians, so incompetent in the eyes of a paternal bureau, have done worse?

I do not want to be unjust. Assistant Commissioner Meritt insisted before the committee that the irrigation project is an engineering success. Yes; the water runs in the canal, when it does not freeze. It is a success similar to that of the surgeon who performs a delicate operation most successfully, save that the patient dies.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that bureau officials who look down with scorn upon the Indians and claim a divine right to order their every action led them into a trap which has cost more than a million dollars; not only led them into it, but expects them to pay for the trap, for this is another reimbursable hoax and the Indians are helpless to prevent liens against their property to meet the costs of this infamous irrigation bubble.

Unless something is done the Blackfeet Indians are doomed. They are almost at the end of the trail. The divine-right theory has nearly reached its end—destruction. The President asked Congress to appropriate money for their relief last year and we passed a bill, but it was like putting a sticking plaster on a cancer.

James Willard Schultz, author of several books dealing with Indian life, has issued a piteous appeal to charitably inclined Americans to send money to the Blackfeet Indians relief fund, at Browning, Mont., so that rations may be issued to the starving.

Here is a paragraph from his appeal:

Owing to the starved condition of the Blackfeet, tuberculosis and infectious diseases of the eye are rapidly increasing among them. I saw one of the three physicians on the reservation who are in the Indian Service. I hear many complaints about him. It can be proven that he would not go 300 yards from his house to see a sick man who had become delirious; and that he would not come out of his house to see a woman who had an infected hand, because, as his wife said, "that was his vacation time of two weeks."

Mr. Chairman, the pathetic history of the Blackfeet is eloquent answer to the question as to whether this great annual contribution from the American taxpayers is of benefit to the Indians.

I maintain that practically every dollar of this appropriation works an injury to the Indians, in whose name it is taken from the Treasury.

Let any one who doubts that statement compare the Chippewa Indians of Michigan with the Chippewas of Minnesota.

The Michigan Indians are not under the bureau, while their brothers of Minnesota are held securely under bureau domination. That offers a fair test. Here are the same Indians, with the same ancestry and the same blood and breeding, but with different environment.

What has been the result? The Chippewas of Michigan became citizens through treaty and legislation in 1845. The last payments under the treaty were made in 1872, and they have been required to shift for themselves since that time.

They have established common schools and they are a part of the American communities where they live. They speak the English language. Though they do not have the majority of voters in the townships Indians have been elected to all the offices within the gift of the electorate. There have been Indian school directors, supervisors, and justices of the peace, while a number have held county offices. Two-thirds of them own their own homes, and there are no more paupers among them than among the white population. Out of their ranks have come ministers, lawyers, and teachers. Some of them are mechanics and others are farmers. Whether in industrial cities or on the farms they have made good in competition with all the world. They are real American citizens, of whom America may well be proud.

What of their brothers in Minnesota who have been guarded and sustained by the Indian Bureau? The current law provides \$95,000 for the "civilization and support" of the Chippewa Indians of Minnesota. It provides \$51,000 for the support and education of Indian pupils in Indian schools. It provides \$46,570 for the tuition of Indian pupils in other schools. It provides for superintendents and teachers and employees by the score to hold the reins tight over these Indians.

What has this money accomplished for the Indians? Listen to the letter sent out by the official council of the Chippewas of Minnesota, copy of which was addressed to every Member of Congress within the past six months:

As a tribe we have been dispossessed of our homes, our liberties, our lands, our wild-rice beds, our wild-berry fields, our timber, our sugar bushes, our hunting and trapping grounds. Our basket making, rug and blanket weaving, bead work, and canoe making are so imitated and cheaply manufactured by the white man that we can no longer compete. We are a people who under the present paternal system of Indian administration are deprived of every self-independent right, who are languishing in misery and dying of starvation.

You can call the roll of the Indian tribes of America and the response will be one great chorus of protest against the present system of control and the money distributed in a way to perpetuate the Indian Bureau.

However, Mr. Chairman, I know how quickly will come back the answer that these benighted Indians are not capable of knowing what is best for themselves. They are ignorant and are unworthy of attention.

In God's name, who is responsible for that situation? The Indian Bureau has had absolute power over the Indians for a long, long time. Its employees have trained these Indians under the reservation system in the way they said was best. Now they find fault with the Indian and his intelligence, but never with the system which blighted his intelligence and enforced his ignorance. Even a cat or dog or a bird can be trained if the method is right. But wrong methods through 50 years have left many Indians to-day who can not even speak the English language. If the Indians to-day are not able to speak intelligently concerning their own problems, the fault is the bureau's alone.

The Government is something separate and apart from these Indians. They have been made inferior through autocratic control, and then because they are inferior they are barred from exercising any rights or responsibilities. The Indian Bureau is exactly as logical as the brutal son who murdered his father and mother and then besought the judge for mercy on the ground that he was an orphan.

The only way to make any people responsible is to give them responsibilities. To forbid them any voice in their own affairs is to take away every inducement to allegiance and loyalty to the Government. It makes the victims incompetent, spiritless, and sullen.

The Indian Bureau has cunningly and with method reached out for new undertakings. It has bound them round with red tape and confusions, adding more complexities at every step. The result is useless agencies, silly duplication, and wicked waste of money.

The Indian Bureau is a despot which can do as it likes with the life, liberties, the possessions, and the occupation of every individual Indian on the rolls. Its only thought in meeting a problem is through tyrannical exercise of arbitrary power. Not by counsel but by coercion does it undertake its tasks. It relies on force, never on fellowship. Its policy is the exact opposite of the fundamental principles upon which the American Nation was founded. To its inspection and control and interference is subject everything that an Indian does or says or thinks or has. It is the most determined enemy of personal freedom and civil liberty that can be found anywhere on earth since the Czar of all the Russias lost his throne.

The Indian Bureau is not an agency of service; it is a great army of officeholders paid out of the Treasury and performing work which in large measure injures the Indians and the common welfare.

Mr. Chairman, I know many Indians do not have business ability to-day. How could they have when their training has come through a system in itself woefully unbusinesslike and inefficient?

H. N. Graves, accountant with the United States Bureau of Efficiency, testified before the Indian Affairs Committee of the House in the last Congress. Denouncing the bureau for lack of even the most ordinary care in its bookkeeping system, he said:

It is my opinion that the property accounting system up to July, 1917, was practically worthless, accomplished no purpose whatever. No such thing as an inventory was taken.

Mr. Graves undertook to put in an accounting system. He stated that his plan was designed so that data would be obtained as to the cost of operating each activity—such as dormitories, schools, farms, gardens, and so forth.

Our idea was—

Said Mr. Graves—

that if it happened that the farm was operated at a loss, our system would disclose the fact. This was not popular. Few people in the Indian Service are interested to know whether farms are being operated at a loss. Consequently the feature has been eliminated.

Of course, direct methods and businesslike plans were unpopular and were eliminated. The bureau system depends upon confusion, complexity, and circumlocution.



Out on the reservations nothing is permitted, everything is either ordered or forbidden. The veriest trifle must be referred to some official who starts in through a maze of red-tape procedure.

What can an Indian learn of forestry when he is compelled to deal with supervisors of forests, forest examiners, forest rangers, forest assistants, forest guards, each of whom may issue different orders and regulations to these helpless wards.

If an Indian needs seed for his garden, he may apply to the farmer of his district, who refers it to the clerk at the agency, who refers it to the superintendent, who refers it to the subsection head at Washington, who refers it to the section chief, who refers it to the field supervisor, who refers it to the field inspector, who refers it to the superintendent of the agency, who refers it to the clerk, who refers it to the farmer. The farmer makes a complete investigation and reports that the Indian might possibly use the seed to advantage if the cost is reimbursed out of his crop. That report goes up the spiral stairway and back again until it reaches the agency office.

The superintendent orders his clerk to get the seed to the Indian. The clerk orders an Indian messenger boy to deliver the package. The boy can pass it no further down the line. He kicks his dog and sullenly delivers the seed to the Indian, whose garden is buried beneath the snows of winter.

On page 196 of the hearings on the Interior Department appropriation bill for the year 1923, Assistant Commissioner Meritt explains that the bureau uses Indian labor and Indian boys in the construction and repair of agency buildings. He states that they make good carpenters, stonemasons, and painters when they have a leader. But here is the pencil of light pointing at the system. Mr. Meritt says:

We put up a building at a cost to the Government of \$5,000 ordinarily, that if constructed outside by a private individual would cost \$20,000 or \$25,000, because we are not required to pay for labor. It is a part of the training of the boys.

Great credit is taken for this cheap construction, but nothing could show more clearly the utter misconception of the true purpose of the bureau. The bureau does not secure its right to exist because it can erect reservation buildings cheaply through involuntary servitude. The bureau was really established to help the Indians become self-supporting, self-respecting citizens. Self-respect comes from an honest day's pay for an honest day's work. If these Indians make "good carpenters, stonemasons, and painters," they are entitled to the pay due for their labors.

Mr. Chairman, it would be far better to build self-respecting American manhood than to build reservation buildings without labor costs.

It would be far better to abolish the bureau than to abolish the opportunities for these human beings to get what they earn by faithful, constructive service.

W. H. Gibbs, formerly inspector in the Indian Service, who resigned because of this refusal on the part of the bureau to give the Indian a fair chance, said:

Entering the Indian Service in the belief that the bureau was designed and conducted as a benevolence to the race, I am leaving it convinced that it is the Indian Old Man of the Sea, who will try to cling to his neck in a strangle hold forever.

Mr. Chairman, the money spent to keep these Indians under a guardhouse system works a deadly injury to the Indians themselves.

Would anyone advocate the reservation and agency system for the immigrants who come here from foreign lands? Would anyone propose to resurrect the freedman's bureau and put all negroes under a bureaucracy? Then, why continue to pay out millions in order that the Indians may be segregated, supervised, and schooled on reservations remote from contact with American life?

All we need is a very small fraction of the faith of William Penn, whose treaty with the Indians 240 years ago was kept inviolate. From the day that treaty was made to the death of William Penn not a white man in Penn's woodlands was killed by an Indian nor was an Indian killed by a white man. Voltaire says it was the only treaty never sworn to and never broken.

Why was it that when other colonies were suffering from Indian wars Pennsylvania was free from every menace? Why was it that for generations the Indian tribes revered and protected the followers of William Penn?

There was but one reason. William Penn treated the Indians as men entitled to every human right. Even when wilderness was king and the Indians were the product of savage environment this statesman did not fear to deal with them as equals. To the Indians gathered under the great elm he said:

The Great Spirit who rules the heavens and earth and who knows the inmost thoughts of man knows that we have a hearty desire to live in peace and friendship with you and to serve you to the utmost of our power.

That was a splendid sentiment, but, of course, it was utterly worthless unless translated into action. The Indian Bureau also prates about friendship for the Indian and desiring to serve him.

But William Penn was not trying to exploit the Indians. His treaty recited that the Indians were not to be molested in their lawful pursuits, even in the territory they had sold. They were to have the same liberty to do all things relating to the improvement of their lands and the support of their families that the English had.

That was the secret of the strength of William Penn's treaty. The Indian was treated as a man, not a serf.

I will not compare our friendship to a chain—

Said William Penn—

for the rain might rust it or a tree fall and break it, but I shall consider you as the same flesh and blood with us and the same as if one man's body were to be divided into two parts.

"Equal rights" was the motto of William Penn, and how successful it proved. "All paths shall be open and free to both Christian and Indian" ran the treaty. Is it any wonder that such a league of friendship was kept bright and clean without a spot and was held firm to the third and fourth generation of those who made it?

This great treaty was made with an Indian council. Penn was enthusiastic for such a plan of action. In a letter written in 1683 to friends in England he said:

Every king has his council, and that consists of all the old and wise men of his nation. Nothing of moment is undertaken, be it war, peace, selling of land, or traffic, without advising with them, and, what is more, with the young men, too.

William Penn took steps to enforce his views. Not a settler could come to Pennsylvania unless he subscribed to the conditions.

No man shall by any ways or means, in word or deed, wrong any Indian but shall incur the same penalty of the law as if he had committed it against his fellow planters.

If an Indian wronged a planter, the white man was not permitted to be his own judge upon the Indian, but must bring his case before the courts for determination. As long as any of these Indians lived in Pennsylvania they would assemble in some spot as nearly as possible like that where they met their friend. There they would lay the speeches of William Penn upon a blanket and with great satisfaction review the proceedings of the great treaty.

Even when exiled from the lands of their ancestors, these Indians taught their children the name of the friend, William Penn, who a century and a half before had treated them as human beings.

William Penn believed that in all ages—

Every human heart is human;  
That in even savage bosoms  
There are longings, yearnings, strivings  
For the good they comprehend not;  
That the feeble hands and helpless,  
Groping blindly in the darkness,  
Touch God's right hand in that darkness  
And are lifted up and strengthened.

William Penn had the sense of the brotherhood of mankind. The Indian Bureau is built on the false assumption that the Indians are inferior beings, possessed of no rights which bureau employees should recognize. In my estimation that belief and policy degrades these self-styled superiors more than their despised fellow creatures.

Mr. Chairman, the Indian problem will disappear when the Indian is treated as a man. The great difficulty is that some 5,000 persons look upon the Indian question as their official pasture, where they graze at governmental expense.

They have "helped" the Indians until he is now helpless. It is time to give the Indian the property to which he is entitled and then let him shift for himself. Some of them will fail, but that is the fate of some white men, too, in the race of life. Better than slavery.

But as a matter of fact, the vast majority of Indians, thrown on their own resources, will make good. They will find work and do it. Fewer employees will be on the bureau pay roll, but more Indians will be civilized.

Abraham Lincoln, in a message to Congress in 1864, said:

I submit for your special consideration whether our Indian system shall not be remodeled. Many wise and good men have impressed me that this can be profitably done.

Sixty years have passed since that recommendation. The Indian Bureau, which then was beginning to show its possibilities for evil power, has become a Frankenstein creation. For every reason that Lincoln had for remodeling the system there are ten thousand now. In 60 years there has been a multiplication of taxes and expenditures. The solution is simply the old-time command, "Let this people go." All Indians born within the limits of the United States should be declared citi-



zens and entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of such citizens.

Every reservation should be allotted to the Indians so that each may have his individual homestead. The tribal property should be divided. Minors and incompetents should be treated exactly as are similar persons of the white race, their property administered in the courts of the States.

There should be arrangements for a final accounting by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs at a certain fixed date. Each Indian tribe should be permitted to act through its freely elected council and a final settlement made, so that in all the future these original Americans shall be members of America.

Mr. Chairman, the Indian Bureau system is a wastrel, profligate beyond description. It wastes every year millions of dollars collected from American taxpayers and millions more abstracted from the possessions of the Indians themselves. It wastes still other millions which would accrue from this untaxed Indian wealth once it was Americanized. It wastes the self-respect of a race and the possibilities of a proud people. It wastes material resources by inefficiency and spiritual resources by dependency and pauperism. It wastes the confidence of the Indians by setting up decoys that lead them to their doom. It wastes their labor by setting them at futile tasks which have no value in American civilization. It wastes their youth in segregated schools which perpetuate tribalism. It wastes their maturity by keeping them in wigwam and tepee and making them aliens in the land of their fathers. It wastes money and manhood, character and citizenship, and conserves only idleness and ignorance and vice.

In this day of conservation, it is time to stop this waste. In this day when overburdened taxpayers are praying for economy it is time to save money whose expenditure works injury to the American Indian and the American public alike.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a very great deal of interest to the very earnest speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]. I think perhaps it is well to have a speech of that sort made occasionally in regard to the Indian appropriations, or in regard to any other appropriations. I think a speech of that kind calling attention, with possibly a little exaggeration, to some of the evils that necessarily and unavoidably creep into Government operations is a good thing, and yet I think the gentleman himself, who knows a good deal about Indians and the Indian question, although he has not lived among the red men, I imagine, very much, would scarcely subscribe to some of the suggestions that were made by some of those he quoted.

The Indian problem is a very great one and has been from the beginning of white settlement in America. In so far as we have erred in the management, development, and settlement of that problem, I think we have erred in generosity, in doing too much rather than doing too little. I have very little patience with those who constantly and continuously wail about the alleged frauds against the Indians and constantly assert that we have not performed our duty toward them. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we have overcoddled the Indians. We have unwisely undertaken some development of his land that should not have been undertaken. It has all been done out of a spirit of generosity and out of a desire to do our duty to those people who are the wards of the Government. But I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania will agree that we can scarcely turn the red man adrift. It is a long, long, weary, trying road from barbarism to civilization, and even those red men who were most advanced when our forefathers found them here had a long and weary road to travel to reach the goal of the white man's civilization. Many of them have not reached it yet. We are trying to civilize the Indian by moral suasion—that is, trying to give him our kind of civilization. That civilization is based on work, hard work, self-sacrifice. He is not given to exertion or self-sacrifice except in the chase and in war.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Right there will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In a moment.

And it takes a long time for him to learn the lessons of self-sacrifice, of self-control, and of thought for the future, of work, of effort.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman states that civilization is based on hard work and effort?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Is it not rather based on contact with civilization? And by keeping Indians on reservations we are keeping them from civilization?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is confusing a fact with a method. I agree with the gentleman that one of the best ways to civilize a man is to bring him in close contact with civilization. That is one reason why I have been in favor of allowing the Indian on the unopened reservation to sell his surplus land or to sell the lands of his deceased ancestors in order that white settlers may be brought onto the reservation, and in order that he may secure the benefit of contact with those white settlers. We should constantly reduce the number of Indians over whom we exercise supervision. But that separation of the Indian from Government supervision can not and must not be done hurriedly, without thought, care, and preparation. It is all very well to talk about putting these men not accustomed to the ways of civilization on their own feet and compelling them to make their way among white men. That all sounds very well, but our experience has been that in many cases where we have attempted to do that the Indian has become a pauper. His condition has grown infinitely worse instead of better. And yet we should just as rapidly as possible, and through the best methods that experience justifies, place the Indian in a position of self-support, of self-respect, and of independence. But it must be done with reason. It must be done with judgment. It must be done with intelligence. We have no greater problem before us than that. For quite a number of years and under several Commissioners of Indian Affairs we were gradually passing their lands to the Indians in individual ownership and control. We were reducing the reservations. We were reducing the number of Indians with whom we had official contact. That was the proper procedure. Then under commissioners in the last administration we reversed that policy, unwisely, in my opinion, and at least one commissioner seemed delighted to go afield and find men in Texas, in Georgia and in Florida, and possibly in Maine, who had some little Indian blood whom he could bring under the Government's tent. It was all wrong. It was all a mistake.

There are some items in this bill that are here by reason of that reversal of policy. We should return, we are returning, we have returned, under the present management of the Indian Office, as I understand it, to the policy of gradually putting the Indian on his feet and placing him in a position where he can care for himself. But it is still a tedious procedure, and it must be pursued with very great care and with full knowledge of the very great responsibility we have upon us.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Before I yield I want to pay a tribute to the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, well known to the membership of this House, a man who served here with very great credit for many years.

I believe he is the best Commissioner of Indian Affairs we have ever had, and I believe that under his management we will have the development of a policy which my friend from Pennsylvania would, I think, in the main approve; a policy under which we shall gradually and as rapidly as we may with safety, having due regard for the interest of the Indian, remove him from governmental restrictions and place him upon his own feet when we are sure that he will be able to stand and maintain himself.

Now I yield.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I am disappointed, I will say to the gentleman, by the fact that there is over a million dollars' increase in this bill over last year.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think the fact of an increased appropriation necessarily proves an extension of the bureau's activity. Such an increase may be necessary to the development of the policy of gradually making the Indian self-reliant and self-supporting.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. May I have one minute more?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. MONDELL. We might for a year, or even for a series of years, increase the appropriations and still be steadily following the policy of gradually reducing the number of Government wards and limiting the Federal control over them.

I do not know the character of the items by which the bill is increased. I do agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania that a great mistake was made in attempting to irrigate on an extensive scale the lands of the Blackfeet Indians, for instance. I know that territory very well. I know that it was very unwise to attempt that irrigation on a large, ex-



pensive scale. And yet there were many people, locally and friends of the Indians generally, who were as insistent in regard to that expenditure as men ever were for any good cause in the world.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. As I recall, the Blackfeet appropriation is reimbursable from tribal funds.

Mr. MONDELL. Yes; if there ever are any tribal funds. But even assuming that is so, we should lay no obligation on these Indians for ditches that may never be used for irrigation development that is not practicable, where the end does not justify the expenditure, because we assume that the lands over which these ditches are built are some time in the distant future to pay the obligation. They probably never will. We shall be very fortunate, indeed, if we can care for the Blackfeet Tribe as we should care for them with the resources that can be secured from their property without any very large lien upon it for irrigation purposes. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STEVENSON].

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for a little while two matters relating to taxation. The first one has arisen within the last two or three days. Last June we passed through the House a bill increasing the right of States as to the taxation of national banks, authorizing them where they desired to be progressive and to impose income taxes instead of property taxes to tax the income of national banks instead of a property tax on the stock of national banks, provided they did not tax them at a higher rate than they taxed the income from other securities. In another body in the last day or two there has been considerable criticism by a distinguished citizen, acceded to by another distinguished citizen, of the fact that the House did not do anything for the people in that legislation. One citizen makes the statement that we now can only tax national-bank stock as we tax other ordinary citizens; that formerly we could tax stock the same as we could other competing capital, and not higher, but that now, under recent decisions, we can only tax it the same as we tax the property of ordinary individuals invested in choses in action and in other investments, and that it has caused great trouble in the State of New York. And he puts in an interview with Mayor Hylan, in which he threatens to go to jail because of the decision of the court of New York. Another gentleman arises in such other body and says that Massachusetts is in the same fix.

Now, what is the truth about it? The statement made in the other body that we are not now confined to taxing the national banks at the same rate as applied to competing capital refers to the decision of the New York Court of Appeals on the very question in which the full court says, "The taxing of national bank shares must not discriminate in favor of capital entering into competition with national banks." It says:

The tax on national-bank shares must not discriminate in favor of moneyed capital entering into competition with the national banks. The court below has found that the competing capital in the hands of individuals, subject only to the personal property income tax, is very large.

If the principle of substantial equality of taxation under State authority, as between capital so invested and other moneyed capital in the hands of individual citizens however invested, operates to disturb the peculiar policy of some of the States in respect of revenue derived from taxation, the remedy therefore is with another department of the Government and does not belong to this court.

The act which was passed by this House says that bank stock must not be taxed at a higher rate than other competing capital, and yet we have these distinguished men criticizing the House because it did not take care of them in that very way.

What was the situation in New York? The situation is found by the court in New York that the ordinary individuals—those put into a class by these distinguished gentlemen as ordinary individuals—with whom we had to equalize the national banks, operated with \$200,000,000 capital in banking in the city of New York, and these are given as the names of ordinary individuals. They are J. P. Morgan & Co.; Kuhn, Loeb & Co.; H. W. Seligman; Hallgarten & Co.; Lodenbury, Thalman & Co.; Goldman, Sacks & Co.; Blair & Co.; and others. These are the ordinary individuals, with \$200,000,000 that come in competition with the banks. Under the law the national banks were taxed \$1,000 on every hundred thousand dollars, while these ordinary individuals were taxed not exceeding \$300—

less than one-third. Yet complaint is made that we are destroying the rights of the States because we do not allow the States to enact legislation to kill national banks, which, by the way, was prepared, I am informed, by the tax association, at that time presided over by the distinguished Member of this House from New York [Mr. MILLS].

Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts in another body says that Massachusetts is in the same fix. Let us see about Massachusetts. Massachusetts's own member of the Banking and Currency Committee admitted that the national banks in Massachusetts in 1921 paid \$2,999,000 in taxes, but if they had been taxed on the same basis that Lee Higginson & Co., Kidder, Peabody & Co., and other international bankers that occupied the same business relations in Boston that Morgan & Co. did in New York they would be taxed only \$490,000.

And yet they say in criticism that the House of Representatives went ahead and refused to give authority to continue the tremendous preference to these people. We did refuse to help them perpetuate this outrageous discrimination against the banks that are the very foundation of our reserve banks.

That is all I have to say about that feature of taxation. The record of the House of Representatives is one of fairness. I was on the committee that prepared it, and there is no escape from the logical conclusion reached as to what legislation was needed.

Now, I want to discuss for a little while the proposed constitutional amendment as to the taxing of State securities. What is the proposition? What do we propose to do? In the first place we want to look for a minute at the terms of the proposed amendment. That is the first thing to consider. You will notice that it says:

The United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes derived from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of any State but without discrimination against income derived from such securities and in favor of income derived from securities issued after the ratification of this article by or under the authority of the United States or any other State.

Notice it uses the same term—

By or under the authority of the United States or any other State.

The contention was made here the other day that that applied also to the taxation of railroad bonds or any other kind of bonds that are issued by railroad companies organized under the authority of the State. I do not know where the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS] got his authority, but that was his contention. You will notice that the same term is used. You are to tax the securities issued by or under the authority of the States. You must not, in doing so, discriminate against the securities issued by or under the authority of the United States or any other State. Therefore we must conclude that the term "by or under the authority" refers to the same securities in these instances, to use the identical term; and there being no reason why there should be conferred upon the United States the power to tax railroad securities, for instance, because they happen to be issued by a corporation organized by the State, there is absolutely no sense in putting it into the first, and therefore there can not be any use for concluding that the same term used in the second sentence means anything other than that which it means in the first. Therefore I conclude that the term means that the United States can tax it, but that it can not, in so taxing, discriminate in favor of the United States securities, which are not taxable now, and can not discriminate in favor of these securities which are not taxable now, and it has no reference in the world to any other class of securities, because they are all taxed at the present time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That matter was all gone over very carefully by the committee when this amendment was prepared. The United States, in addition to its own securities, has other securities issued under its authority—issued by or under the authority of the United States, which are not taxable.

Mr. STEVENSON. I submit that the gentleman should not take up my time in stating that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. And that is contrary to what the gentleman said.

Mr. STEVENSON. Not at all.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Those securities stand in just exactly the same light as the corporation securities.

Mr. STEVENSON. What are the securities?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Bonds of the War Finance Corporation, bonds of the farm loan banks, and other bonds that perhaps I may not think of at this time.

Mr. STEVENSON. I was not differentiating as to those. I can not give my friend any more time. He can get time from his own side.



Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman is not fair in so doing. I have not quite concluded.

Mr. STEVENSON. But I have not much time.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. This has all been gone over by the Treasury authorities. The legal authorities there believe that this applies to corporation securities.

Mr. STEVENSON. What corporation securities?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. All corporation securities under the authority of the State and under the authority of the United States.

Mr. STEVENSON. Does the gentleman contend that it applies to railroad corporations, where the railroad is incorporated by the State?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. There is not the slightest question about that.

Mr. STEVENSON. That is his position?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It is my position and, so far as I know, the position of every other attorney.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I would like the gentleman from Iowa to get from the hearings or to get a letter from the legal department of the Treasury a statement that this is their interpretation of the amendment.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have such a letter from the Treasury Department, addressed to me, and I shall put it into the Record at the proper time.

Mr. STEVENSON. If that is the intention, then the United States Government can only tax income from railroad securities as it taxes income from the securities of the city of Alexandria, under this proposition that is put there. I do not concede that that is the case, but let us suppose it is. Then there is another proposition which has come forward, and that is this, that the amendment will enable the United States Government for the next 20 years to tax State and farm-loan bonds, because we have it now admitted that that is intended—and I supposed it was—to tax them, and yet not let a State have a single dollar of tax out of a United States security. But the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLS] said the other day that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] said the United States would not owe any debts, and that that was a mistake, that the United States would always owe debts. The gentleman from Texas did not say that. The gentleman said that in all probability for 20 years the United States would not issue any new bonds. That being the case, there is nothing to prevent the United States from taxing the bonds of States at such a high rate as to absolutely put an incubus upon them; and that is the proposition the gentleman from Texas made, and which I reiterate—and I do reiterate—that the purpose of this is twofold.

It is, first, to burden the States and tax out of existence the power of the States in their operations. The President himself says tax-exempt securities are drying up the sources of Federal taxation and are encouraging unproductive expenditures by the municipalities. He further says:

There is more than the menace in mounting public debt, there is the dissipation of capital which should be made available to the needs of productive industry. The proposed amendment will place the State and Federal Governments and all political subdivisions on an exact equality and will correct the growing menace of public borrowing, which if left unchecked may soon threaten the stability of our institutions.

The necessity for this amendment, if there were any, has certainly not been demonstrated by the facts which have been stated. Mr. Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, says that there is probably a billion dollars of additional indebtedness being issued every year. Let us see about that. The income of the United States is \$50,000,000,000; in 1920, \$23,700,000,000 was taxable income, as against \$6,300,000,000 taxable in 1916, 300 per cent increase in four years. If the States and counties are issuing a billion dollars additional a year, what effect does it have? Two per cent only of the income of the United States will absorb the whole business, or 4 per cent of the taxable income. Does that make a great shelter for all of the great income-tax payers or show a drying up of the sources of supply—\$17,400,000,000 increase in taxable incomes in four years? But I do not accept the proposition that there is a billion being issued every year. There has been no adequate evidence of it. There is less than \$11,000,000,000 outstanding now, and the States and municipalities have been issuing bonds ever since long before the Civil War. But suppose you cut it off at the Civil War, and suppose there was a clean slate. For 55 years we have had issued only \$11,000,000,000; in other words, \$200,000,000 a year, and that is the average. I do not believe it has been accelerated five times within the last two or three years.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEVENSON. I shall have to be excused.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman has misstated what the Secretary said.

Mr. STEVENSON. I shall get what the Secretary said.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. He said it was increasing at the rate of a billion dollars a year.

Mr. STEVENSON. The statement is made by Mr. Mellon and all of you, and that is what he says, that the tax-exempt securities are increasing at the rate of a billion dollars a year; that many more are being issued every year.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no; that many more outstanding.

Mr. STEVENSON. That is the same thing. If it is increasing at the rate of a billion dollars a year, they have to be issued in order to be there, and if there is only a billion increase a year, there is only a billion dollars issued a year as a new debt, and that which retires old debts is no increase.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. All right, if the gentleman wants to stand on that statement.

Mr. STEVENSON. I shall stand on my own statement. What effect is it going to have? Take the record of the sale of bonds of the United States—and Mr. MILLS has put in here a table—that are taxable and those that are not. You will find that the Secretary of the Treasury's report contains that statement. But let us take United States bonds, nontaxable and taxable. Take for the last two or three weeks, and you will find that the average difference between the return on nontaxable and taxable bonds is from 96 cents to a dollar on every hundred dollars. In other words, people go out on the market to buy United States bonds. They buy a nontaxable bond, and they pay more for it, and get less return. It has been running \$3.42 on a hundred dollars. If they buy a taxable bond, they require a higher return. In other words, they pay a lower price. They have been running at about \$4.38 on a hundred dollars on taxable bonds. See the market statements every morning in New York and Washington papers where the return on each kind of United States bonds is given.

Well, what does that mean? It means an increase of 1 per cent that they are requiring on account of the taxable feature. All right. Put an increase of 1 per cent on the farm-loan bonds now issued. \$300,000,000 a year, making the rate to farmers 7 per cent instead of 6. What will it amount to? Three million dollars the first year. If they go on and do not put out more than \$300,000,000 a year, at the end of 10 years, as a burden to be laid on the farmers' backs, there will be \$30,000,000 of an annual interest charge added by this taxation; and as the gentleman from Iowa said, that is one of the things that will go on.

Not only that, but you take the States and they will increase. Let me see; \$11,000,000,000 are outstanding to-day. They say they are issuing a billion a year, or they are increasing a billion a year. That will be an average. The increased interest charge at 1 per cent will amount to \$10,000,000 a year; that is, the increased interest that is put on of 1 per cent. But now you must remember, when you are dealing with the United States securities that are taxed only by the United States, the investor requires a difference of 1 per cent between the taxed and the untaxed bonds. Now, if you will allow the States to tax, where will you land? When the State puts its tax on, you will see they will require 2 per cent, or 1 per cent more, and if they issue one billion a year with 1 per cent additional interest it will be \$20,000,000 in 10 years of increased taxation as long as you issue those bonds; and in 20 years, if you do not increase the tax and increase the difference, you would have \$2,110,000,000 additional tax levied on the people of this country and collected to pay the interest on bonds because of this tax that you levy, and much of which you will not get because they will hide it out. If you put it at 2 per cent, 1 per cent to care for State tax, it will be \$4,220,000,000 in 20 years.

Now, the whole thing about this is that it is boldly proclaimed, and you will see it in the speech of Mr. MacGREGOR, of New York, and in the speech of Mr. MILLS, of New York, and you will see it in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, that the idea is to stop or greatly decrease the issuance of State and municipal bonds, to tax them out of existence.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The President says it is a menace to the country.

Mr. STEVENSON. Yes. The President has made the same statement. You may say, "No; you will never tax anything out of existence." I do not know whether the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was here in 1865-66, but you will recall reading that they put on a 10 per cent tax on bank notes paid out by national banks. Over in Arkansas they made a



bank pay \$160,000 in that way, and it was settled that the tax had to be paid. The United States Supreme Court said this tax is undoubtedly for the purpose of preventing that issue and preventing the States from issuing money, but it is within the power of Congress, and it is not for the court to say that Congress can not tax it out of existence.

Now, in every message and in every speech and document they proclaim that this is for the purpose of putting out of business the matter of issuing securities by and under the authority of the State. Yet they say there will be no danger of taxing them out of existence, when it is the evident purpose in every document that you have.

In the language of the Supreme Court, "Power of Congress to use a tax to destroy can not be questioned." (Bank v. Fenns, 8 Wall. 533.)

Also it says the power to issue free from taxation its securities either by State or Nation free from interference by the other "is an essential element of sovereignty of each." (Pollock v. Fownes L. & T. Co., 157 U. S. 586.)

Now, to come back to the question of the scope of this amendment. What is the object of the proposed legislation? Let us get at its genesis and see. The President in his address to the House on December 8, 1922, made the following statement:

One year ago I suggested the submission of an amendment so that we may lawfully restrict the issues of tax-exempt securities, and I renew that recommendation now. Tax-exempt securities are drying up the sources of Federal taxation and they are encouraging unproductive and extravagant expenditures by States and municipalities. There is more than the menace in mounting public debt; there is the dissipation of capital which should be made available to the needs of productive industry. The proposed amendment will place the State and Federal Governments and all political subdivisions on an exact equality, and will correct the growing menace of public borrowing, which if left unchecked may soon threaten the stability of our institutions.

The Secretary of the Treasury in his report for 1922 made the following statement:

A constitutional amendment, satisfactory to the Treasury and approved by the Attorney General, has already been proposed by joint resolution favorably reported to the last session of Congress by the Committee on Ways and Means. This amendment would apply equally and without discrimination to the Federal Government on the one hand and the State and municipal governments on the other hand, and would, in effect, put an end to future issues of tax-exempt securities, making it possible for the Federal Government to tax income from future issues by or under authority of the several States if, as, and to the extent that it taxes future issues of Federal securities, and for the State governments to tax income from future issues of Federal securities if, as, and to the extent that they tax future issues of their own securities. The amendment, which appears in House Joint Resolution 314, reads as follows—

So the idea is that this merely provides for the taxation of incomes from securities heretofore tax free. Now corporate securities, such as railroad securities, are not in the tax-free list. Hence no power is given over them to either the Nation or State, for such power is already possessed. The bonds of the State and their governmental agencies, such as counties, cities, towns, and school districts, are the only bonds affected by the taxation to be imposed hereunder. Such being the case, the words in the first clause, "by or under the authority of any State," must refer to bonds heretofore tax free. Then the same clause in the latter part of the section, "by or under the authority of the United States or any other State," must refer to the same class of securities, to wit, issues of State or governmental agencies heretofore nontaxable.

When the same phrase is used twice in the same statute the same construction should be used in both. In the language of the Supreme Court of the United States in *United States v. Central Pacific Railway Co.* (118 U. S. p. 240), referring to a similar repetition of language in two statutes referring to the same thing, "we must give the same meaning to like expressions in both."

The Supreme Court of Ohio says that where the same words are used twice in the same section that it is a fundamental rule of construction that if in one case the meaning is clear and in the other obscure, the meaning where it is clear controls both.

*Rhodes v. Weldy* (46 Ohio St. 242):

A word or phrase repeated in a statute will bear the same meaning throughout the statute unless a different intention appears.

Sutherland on statutory construction, section 399, cites many decisions. Certainly nothing appears to show a different meaning between the words "issued by or under authority of" in the two clauses of section 1. The first certainly refers to securities issued by States and their agencies not now subject to taxation, and the second must refer to securities of the United States and "other" States likewise now exempt. If not, and if it refers to railroad securities, why insert the word "other" before State at the end? It thus provides that in taxing State bonds the United States can not discriminate against bonds of other

States which are rendered taxable by this amendment and can not refer to the mass of bonds of private corporations which were always taxable and are not affected by this amendment. These bonds are set off in a class to themselves in *Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* (157 U. S. 583) to such an extent that the sixteenth amendment, giving authority to tax incomes "from whatever source derived," was held not to involve this class in the *Gore* case (*Evans v. Gore*, 253 U. S., p. 246). But Mr. GREEN, author of the amendment, says he and the committee agree that the words "issued by or under the authority of, and so forth," embrace all railroad bonds issued by virtue of authority conferred on a railroad corporation by a State or Nation. If that be so, then the United States can not tax income from railroad bonds or any other kind of bonds at a higher rate than it taxes State bond incomes. If that is the joker, it means a drive by the holders of millions of railroad bonds to get under cover with their income. Naturally a low rate will be contended for by everybody on incomes from State issues, and it must not discriminate against the income from railroad bonds issued by or under authority of "any State"; hence it makes a low rate for railroad bonds. Is this an explanation of the activity of some of the railroad magnates for this bill? Taking the words "under and by authority of" throughout the whole amendment to refer to corporate bonds of private as well as public corporations, it will prevent any higher rate being put on one class than the other.

The first paragraph allows the United States to tax State securities, which includes, according to Mr. GREEN of Iowa, railroad securities, and provides that they, the railroad securities, shall not be discriminated against in favor of United States securities or any other State securities. It simply brings railroad securities in under the protecting wing of United States securities and State securities.

I do not believe the court would construe it that way, but Mr. GREEN of Iowa does, and he says everybody connected with passing it does also, and, if so, then it is building a shelter for holders of railroad bonds. Every railroad mortgage in this country would be foreclosed and the new bonds issued after this amendment is adopted, and all of them come under its terms and stand on the same rate of income taxation as the State and Government bonds.

I warn the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] that his construction of this amendment is not final. The sixteenth amendment was supposed to cover every kind of income, and so distinguished a man as Governor Hughes, of New York, so construed it in transmitting it to the legislature, but the Supreme Court in *Evans against Gore* made that theory look like "two bits."

Now, where do the States come in under the amendment? They can tax their own securities now. Why do not they? Because (a) it increases their interest charge, and (b) in most States they get no tax because all the bonds practically are owned in centers of capital and the State can only get tax on those held by residents. It pays the higher rate and gets nothing in return.

The following statement from *Evans v. Gore* (253 U. S. pp. 255-256) might well be pondered by the people before adopting this:

When we consider what was done in those cases—

Referring to cases holding securities of States and their governmental agencies exempt—

what is comprehended in the congressional power to tax, it becomes additionally manifest that the prohibition now under discussion was intended to embrace any diminution through the exertion of that power, for, as this court has repeatedly held, the power to tax carries with it the power to embarrass and destroy; may be applied to every object within its range in such measure as Congress may determine; enables that body to select one calling and omit another; to tax one class of property and forbear to tax another; and may be applied in different ways to different objects so long as there is geographical uniformity in the duties, excises, and imposts imposed.

I ask again if this is a device to make secure the place of railroad and other corporate bonds under provision that they can not be discriminated against in favor of income from the United States, and if it is the power to select one and leave another that this proposed amendment is intended to limit? If passed, could a tax be laid on the income of a railroad bond if none were imposed on United States bonds? Mr. GREEN's construction would lead to the negative answer. The first section, as construed by him and written out, would read:

The United States shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income derived from State, county, municipal, and school district, and railroad and other corporate bonds issued under authority of any State, but without discrimination against such State and railroad bonds, etc., and in favor of income on any like bonds issued by or under authority of the United States or any State.

Hence, if only normal tax is levied on United States bonds, only normal tax can be levied on railroad bonds, and so forth.



This will be a shelter for railroad and other corporate bonds if that view is sustained by the courts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to pay my respects to the able Secretary of the Interior and to the different heads of the bureaus under him and say that I believe that department of our Government is being administered with great efficiency and ability. I am sorry I shall not have time to discuss the work of the various branches of this department with something of thoroughness. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] a few minutes ago discussed at some length the Indian Bureau. During the consideration of the bill I shall refer to particular features of his criticism. At this time, however, I wish to refer to the general effect of his criticism of our Indian policy and what we hope to do. For the head of the important Bureau of Indian Affairs I have profound respect. I do not like to make comparisons, but I will say that in my judgment there never was a man who presided over that bureau who surpassed Commissioner Burke in any line, whether in understanding the problems of the bureau or in administration, whether from the standpoint of coming into contact with the wards of the Government on the one hand or presenting his problem to the Congress on the other.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has referred to the Indian Bureau as one that ought to be wiped out. I think we are all in favor of that, but we are in favor of taking a little more time than he would take in accomplishing this result. The gentleman has referred to the negro problem and how the work of caring for the negroes in something of a similar paternal way following the Civil War was abandoned after a few years' trial. Well and good. It should have been abandoned. But in the Indian problem you have one that is entirely different from the problem that confronted the country at that time. True enough, millions of negroes were transformed from slaves into free men; they were ignorant, and they were without property. But the case of the negro is not the case of the Indian. First of all, the negroes could speak the language of the community where they had lived in a degree that would permit them to get along, earn a livelihood, and do the work they were accustomed to do.

Not so with the Indian. The negroes were accustomed to living in homes, modest it may be, most of them, but at any rate a home, and the system of the home, and the manner of their living, were factors that modified the problem of transition from a status of slavery to one of freemen. But what of the Indian? We are taking the Indians from the time when they were able to roam over a great continent, a population of possibly 400,000, a time when they earned their livelihood not in the field but by their prowess most of all as huntsmen, and we are asking them to compete in a highly organized age among people who themselves are industriously working to bring from the soil that which will support a large population. The negroes at the close of the Civil War were neighbors to the whites, and fairly evenly scattered amongst a large white population. The Indians never were so scattered. They have held together as tribes speaking their own language and following customs and habits different and apart from their white rivals.

I do not assume we have not made mistakes. We have made many blunders. But to suddenly wipe out the Indian Bureau and forget that we have an Indian problem would be the greatest blunder we could now commit. More, it would be a colossal crime.

What is our problem? When I was a boy and lived in what we call the Palouse country, a fine band of Indians called the Nez Percés had been placed upon their tribal lands. These lands were not allotted at that time but they belonged to the tribe. But the lands turned over to the Indians though now supporting thousands of people were not sufficient to support a comparatively small tribe of some 1,500 Indians in the way they had been accustomed to live.

At that time northern Idaho and eastern Washington were not very thickly populated, and while these Indians had their tribal bounds they roamed over areas of hundreds of thousands of acres beyond those tribal bounds for the purpose of hunting and fishing and gathering fruit for their livelihood and for the coming winter. As a boy I remember seeing them go by our home. In the woods I remember seeing bundles or rolls of mesh—

sticks woven together by rawhide—upon which they would dry their fruit or their fish, and then roll the mesh into a bundle and put it into a place where it could be found the succeeding year—100 or 200 miles from where the Indians lived.

Then white people came in, the country settled up, and it was up to our Government to provide some way to help those Indians, to provide them some way to earn their livelihood. These Indians are not pauper Indians. They never have been. Most of them are not yet good farmers, but they are learning. They can not roam and hunt as they did 25 or 35 years ago; they must earn their support from the lands that were allotted to them when their reservation was opened to settlement nearly 30 years ago.

Another picture: A few years ago I fell into conversation on an eastbound train with one of the brightest Indians I ever met, who told me that he came from the Macaw Tribe of Indians over on Puget Sound. He told me some of the tribal history. He pointed back to about 130 years ago when his tribe had a population of 3,000. He related that through the barter of skins and other products to some Spanish traders for clothing the members of his tribe had become infected with smallpox, and that after the scourge had swept over that Indian tribe only one-tenth of the population remained.

He told me further that that was the first introduction of smallpox into the Northwest, and it reduced other tribes in enormous degree. The Indians in their native state had their medicine men and some helpful herbs, but they have not been able to cope with adjustments of what we call civilization.

If you will take up the reports of the Nez Percé Indians you will find that 50 years ago the medical officers of the Government reported that there was not a single case of tuberculosis among them. If you will take up the reports to-day you will find that notwithstanding as much of the outdoor life as they are able to lead the percentage of tuberculosis among the Indians is as great as it is among the white people, and that it is found in active or latent type among probably 90 per cent of the members of that tribe. We have, then, the problem of health to consider.

The problem of education is another one that we must consider. Twenty-five years ago, when I was a boy in that country, there came back to his home people the first Indian boy who had gone away to the Carlisle School, to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] referred. He was regarded in the school as one of the brilliant students, one of the ablest men. Yet in less than six months he had gone back to the ways of the wikiup and was living the life of a blanket Indian, and why? Well, the greatest reason was because he did not have fellows to associate with who had had his experience, who had caught the inspiration of scholarship, and who by meeting and association could help, each the other, to maintain it. To-day, in increasing degree, the Indian students bring with them the ideals and benefits of the educational opportunities that they have had, and they are not so inclined to go back to the wikiup. And why? Companionship. The first boy who returned had not a single associate with whom he could talk over the experiences of his school days amid happy surroundings. He was alone. But when it came about that in another few years 10, 15, or 50 young men had the same experience, they were able to form something of a companionship and were able to maintain more of the standard of what we call civilization.

I raised this question in connection with the hearings on this bill, and I was told by the head of the educational service of the Indian Bureau that this phenomenon to-day is looming large. The report shows that to-day there is a larger school population in the Indian schools than ever before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. May I have three or four minutes more?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. FRENCH. Not only have we a larger school enrollment than ever before but the children of parents who were given the advantages of school 20 or 30 years ago, even though those parents did not avail themselves much of the ways of the white man's living, are to-day the children readiest in learning in the schools. They not only are the readiest during the first few years, in the beginning of their school work, but all through their school courses they are showing the effects of the training of the parents, although the parents themselves for practical purposes fell back to the life of the tribe.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. If I have the time.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman realize that there are now some 20,000 Indian children of school age who are not in school at all?



Mr. FRENCH. In general figures there are 25,000 Indian children who are not in school, of whom 7,000 are physically unfit to be in school.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; I mean outside of that number.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman wants the exact figures and I have them for the last fiscal year. There were 91,968 children of school age, of which number 64,943 were in school, 6,279 ineligible on account of illness or deformity, and 20,746 not in school at all.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. CARTER. We have provided \$200,000 additional for those children in this bill.

Mr. FRENCH. Yes; and when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] refers to the total amount for the Indian Bureau he will find that nearly half of that, aggregating \$5,100,000, is for educational work among the children of the Indians of our country. Surely this great work must not stop.

Nor can our Government immediately withdraw its supervision of Indian property. Indians to-day have property aggregating more than \$727,000,000 in value. Many Indians would be as helpless as children in handling their personal estates if left to their own discretion. Some of these Indians want their property turned over to their own disposition as soon as possible. These Indians are spurred on by a horde of sharpers, who would make short shrift of the Indians' burdens. Then what? Well, the next thing many of these Indians would be paupers upon the counties where they live.

No. I am for winding up the affairs of the Indians with the Government as speedily as possible, but sound sense dictates that it will take years of time, patience, and care on our part and the gradual pushing off onto the backs of competent Indians responsibilities that more and more they shall be able to bear.

Another thing, we are paying some attention to irrigation. Gentlemen, we must, whether we like to or not. Water rights are passing away, and unless the Government acts now, Indians will awaken in another 25 years to find that they have land that is desert and no available water with which to irrigate. We must act now if we would protect the interests of our wards in a responsibility that we can not throw aside.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes remaining.

Mr. CARTER. I yield that time to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this appropriation bill provides the funds to carry on all the various activities of the Department of the Interior. That department is in many respects a department of public works, because Congress has placed under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior a number of bureaus for whose efficient conduct the best engineering talent and a high degree of constructive ability are required. The United States Reclamation Service has built great reservoirs and canal systems. The Indian Service is likewise engaged in the reclamation of waste lands. The Alaskan Railroad is being constructed and operated under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior. The United States Geological Survey is not only making a study of geological formations but also makes topographic maps of great value. The Bureau of Mines is performing a most beneficial work for the mining industry. All of this constructive effort is essential to the welfare of the Nation and Congress should not be niggardly in providing the necessary funds to enable it to be properly prosecuted in the interest of the entire country.

I want to comment briefly on the attitude of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having charge of this bill with respect to the appropriations for the Department of the Interior. Apparently the members of this subcommittee have been profoundly awed by the Director of the Budget. It seems that, in their opinion, the Budget Director is a grand lama whose edicts they must religiously follow. They have not dared, except in but a few minor instances, to suggest any kind of an increase over the amount allowed in the Budget for the maintenance of this great department.

The subcommittee having charge of the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture recently reported a bill which

shows that they had a much more independent attitude of mind. That subcommittee reported the Agricultural bill to the House, carrying over \$68,000,000, and its action was approved by the House, with only 10 reductions in items authorized by the Budget. These reductions did not amount to anything, except in the appropriations for public roads, the remainder of which will be carried in the next deficiency bill, so that no Federal aid will be lost. But that subcommittee made 10 increases in the Agricultural bill which aggregated \$574,700, of which \$160,000 was for eradicating the cattle tick and \$150,000 for the eradication of the barberry bush.

Now, let us compare this excellent record with that of the subcommittee in charge of the appropriations for the Interior Department. The bill before us contains 67 reductions under the amounts authorized by the Budget, totaling \$1,092,000. This subcommittee has made but four increases, three of them out of the Treasury, aggregating \$34,400, and one out of Indian tribal funds, amounting to \$35,000. Balancing these total increases of but \$69,400 against the \$574,700 of increases made in the Agricultural bill, am I not justified in saying that this subcommittee did not have either the initiative or the independence which the agricultural subcommittee has conclusively shown that it possessed?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman from Arizona realize that what he is saying is a splendid tribute to this subcommittee?

Mr. HAYDEN. Upon the contrary, I am paying my tribute to the subcommittee which had in charge the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, which exercised its own independent judgment. Its members looked into the facts, ascertained what was necessary to be done, and did not hesitate to disagree with the Director of the Budget. They boldly increased essential appropriations, and the House approved of every one of their recommendations. This subcommittee has timidly refused to go beyond the sums stated in the Budget. They were no more responsive to appeals for additional funds than a blank wall. Regardless of the merits of any proposal, if it was not in the sacred Budget it was not to be even considered.

I hope that next year the members of this subcommittee will cultivate a more open mind. It may be that in the rush of a short session of Congress they have not had the time to make independent investigations of the needs of the public service. But I trust that next December they will go outside of the limited data contained in the Budget and see for themselves what is needed. Let the subcommittee exercise its own judgment, because I am sure that the House will have more confidence in any independent conclusions that its Members may reach than we have in the Director of the Budget.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman has paid a tribute to the subcommittee by saying that he has more confidence in their opinion than that of the Budget. Of course, he will follow them without question in all the reductions which they have made.

Mr. HAYDEN. I may follow the subcommittee in a great many instances, but what I want the members of the subcommittee to do is to exercise their own mental faculties. I have confidence in them as men and Members of this House. We have reposed a trust in them and I desire that they shall fully exercise the power that has been granted and to do what in their best judgment ought to be done instead of arbitrarily limiting the scope of their authority by an unyielding determination not to go beyond that which has been authorized by the Budget.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE INDIAN SERVICE.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] a few moments ago submitted some remarks on the appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I should like to direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that of the \$11,000,000 carried in this bill for appropriations out of the Treasury for the Indian Service \$5,200,000 is expended for the education of the Indians.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. How does the gentleman know that the \$1,977,000 for the general school fund is used for education?

Mr. HAYDEN. Because it is all devoted to that purpose.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Is not some of it devoted to and used for stockmen and farmers? It has been used in part for that purpose.



Mr. CARTER. Oh, no. The appropriation for the school is a specific appropriation to be used only for schools, and the stockmen and farmers come under another item in the bill—under the industrial appropriations.

Mr. HAYDEN. In addition to the \$5,200,000 appropriated for education over \$2,000,000 is devoted to Indian irrigation developments of one character or another. So that over \$7,000,000 of the \$11,000,000 contained in the gratuity appropriations for the Indian Bureau are for these two most useful and civilizing purposes.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] has given the House much alleged information about the Indian problem. I would be pleased to know how and where he acquired it, whether by reading what somebody else has written or by talking with somebody who has been on the Indian reservations, or whether he made any investigations for himself?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows where I got most of this information. I sat with him on the Indian Affairs Committee for two years and I have been on the reservations and visited the schools.

Mr. HAYDEN. How many reservations and schools?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. A number of them. I spent several weeks at the Carlisle School and I have been on some of the western reservations.

Mr. HAYDEN. Which Indian reservations?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The Crow and the Blackfeet.

Mr. HAYDEN. Those are the only two? The gentleman has personally visited the Carlisle Indian School in Pennsylvania and the Crow and Blackfeet Reservations in Montana?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. And for two years I made extensive study with the gentleman on the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, I served with the gentleman on that committee and listened to the testimony of many witnesses, but I want to say to the gentleman that one look is better than a thousand words. If one goes upon the reservations he can see and know the facts, but when some one else tells about the conditions there, without a background of experience, no man can form a mental picture of the situation or reach an accurate understanding of the facts.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman from Arizona will yield to me, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that the farmers are provided for under the industrial item on page 25.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I shall quote a statement by the assistant commissioner where he says that he took out of this education fund a sum for stockmen and farmers.

Mr. HAYDEN. The opinions of the gentleman from Pennsylvania are not based on any intimate personal knowledge of actual conditions on the Indian reservations. He confesses that he has been to but one school and to but two reservations. Therefore the conclusions which the gentleman has submitted to this House must not be taken as seriously as though they were based upon information which he had acquired himself. His views are founded upon what somebody else told him. He brings practically nothing but secondhand information. It is hearsay evidence that he has presented to the House. Those of us who have personally visited many Indian reservations, who have seen the Indian school system in actual operation, who know of the good work done in reclamation of lands, and who have observed the conduct of the business of the Indian Service generally, will not confirm the very serious charges made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania against the Indian Bureau.

This bill very properly carries the sum that it does for education, which is almost half of the total of the appropriations for the Indian Bureau. The only way to qualify the rising generation of Indians for citizenship is to send them to Indian schools. The gentleman himself, if he were to visit the reservations in the Southwest, where there are many thousands of non-English-speaking Indians, would be the last one to urge that Congress dispense with the present school system. That would also be true if he actually saw the successful Indian irrigation projects there in operation. He happened to go upon two projects situated in the far north where even white men have not made a success of irrigation and therefore he condemns all irrigation projects in other places. I now yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON].

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] made a strong point upon the number of employees that this department has. Has the gentleman any information as to the work that has been accomplished, for instance, under the appropriations for reclamation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall be very glad to furnish the gentleman from Utah with any information of that kind that he may desire.

Mr. COLTON. Are there a larger number of employees than is required to do consistently what is being done under the department?

Mr. HAYDEN. My judgment is that if the scale of salaries were higher for positions in the Indian Service there would undoubtedly be more efficiency among the employees. The rates of pay are low and are fixed by a basis which was established a long time ago. So far as the building of irrigation systems or any other constructive work done on the reservations are concerned, I am sure that the Indian Service gets as good results for the money expended as does the Reclamation Service or any other branch of the Government engaged in like public works.

#### THE SALT RIVER RECLAMATION PROJECT, ARIZONA.

There is a very remarkable statement in the hearings to which I want to direct the attention of the House, in order to correct a serious misapprehension of the facts. I refer to the hearings, where the chairman of this subcommittee questioned the Director of the United States Reclamation Service on the conduct of the affairs of that bureau.

Mr. SNELL. On what page?

Mr. HAYDEN. On page 619. These remarks of the chairman of the subcommittee refer to the Salt River reclamation project in Arizona:

Mr. CRAMTON. So that, in this case, the Government took all of the chances, put in millions and millions of dollars, loaned the money without interest, gave them 20 years in which to repay it, and then postponed for 10 years the beginning of any payments, and with no interest running; constructed a power project; planned and financed it; made a success of it, and then turned the power project over to the water users in order that they might use the receipts from the power project to pay for the land made tremendously valuable by irrigation?

Then a little later in the hearings the gentleman from Michigan says that the water users under that project might be termed "profiteers."

Complaint is not only made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] but I have heard it made elsewhere, that the Salt River project should have been declared completed much sooner than it was, and reimbursement begun by the water users. That project, instead of being completed in 1910, as the gentleman from Michigan stated in the hearings, was never actually completed by the Reclamation Service. According to the tenth annual report of the Director of the Reclamation Service, the contractor finished work on the Roosevelt Dam on February 5, 1911. On March 19, 1911, the dam was dedicated by President Roosevelt, so that particular feature of the project was completed at that time. The project was officially declared completed, although, in fact, much construction remained to be done, and turned over to the water users on November 1, 1917. Between 1911 and 1917 there is a period of 6 years instead of 10 years, as the gentleman has asserted, wherein there was apparently no repayment to the United States.

But let us look a little further into the financial relations of the Salt River project to the Government. On the 30th of June, 1911, this report of the Director of the Reclamation Service shows that there had been expended on that project \$9,878,521. Had the Salt River project been declared completed at that time, that is the sum of money that would have been required to be reimbursed to the United States. But it was by no means completed, and that is the very good reason why repayments were not commenced. It was not completed in any sense until 1917, and then, as I have said, the project was not finished. At that time the construction expenditures from the reclamation fund had risen to \$12,744,222, which was an increase of \$2,865,701 over the total construction charge in 1911. This conclusively proves that the gentleman from Michigan was mistaken, because if the Salt River project was completed in 1911, why was it necessary to expend nearly \$3,000,000 additional on its construction?

Within that period of six years the Reclamation Service had been collecting rental charges for the use of water, and actually collecting more than it cost to operate and maintain the project. These reports of the Director of the Reclamation Service which I have before me show that between 1911 and 1917 over \$1,600,000 was collected from the water users of the Salt River project in excess of what was actually necessary to pay for the cost of delivering water to their lands. So that, according to the records, there was a repayment to the reclamation fund within that six-year period of that sum of money.

If the Salt River project had been declared completed in 1911 and payments had begun under the terms of the reclamation act, 2 per cent for four years and 4 per cent for two years, instead of there being returned to the reclamation fund over \$1,600,000, the net repayments would have been \$1,580,563. Therefore by not opening the project by a public notice and by collecting excess money on rental contracts from the water users during that six-year period more money was actually re-



turned to the reclamation fund than there would have been if the Salt River project had been declared completed in 1911.

The gentleman from Michigan apparently was not aware of these facts. I am sure that he did not want to intentionally do any injustice to the water users of the Salt River project, but in making such statements he has done them a great wrong. The figures which I have presented clearly show that the water users during that six-year period were not "profiteers" but actually paid more money into the reclamation fund than the reimbursement would have been if the plan about which he now complains had not been adopted.

To read what the gentleman from Michigan has said anyone would conclude that the entire cost of all power developments on the Salt River project had been paid from the reclamation fund, but such is not the fact. The Reclamation Service expended on the hydroelectric plants a little over \$2,843,000 prior to 1911. They were not completed and could not produce power in any substantiated amount. They were of practically no value. The project manager stated that no more money could be obtained from the reclamation fund for that purpose, so the water users on the project voluntarily assessed themselves \$1,200,000 and completed the power development as planned. Being completed and in operation these power plants have produced a substantial revenue, the benefit of which the project has very properly enjoyed.

The Salt River project was turned over to the water users in November, 1917, but the price fixed in the contract was not the gross construction cost of \$12,744,222. It was that sum less the total amount paid in by the water users toward construction, or a net construction charge of \$10,548,119, repayable to the reclamation fund in 20 years. That is the amount charged against the project in 1917, but it was not a completed project. Since 1917 the water users have assessed themselves \$2,146,000 for additional construction which has been determined to be absolutely necessary.

I am not referring to the operation and maintenance charges. I am not referring to the money that has been raised to pay the \$600,000 which has been returned to the reclamation fund. I am referring to such burdens as the assessments levied to the extent of over \$400,000 to install pumps and drain out water-logged land. It was necessary to expend \$1,500,000 in additions to the power plants, and that was done. Drainage ditches and numerous other works were carried out on the project to complete it. So far as the farmers on the Salt River project are concerned, they have paid out more money from their own pockets than the farmers on any other reclamation project in the United States.

If the gentleman from Michigan will take into consideration the fact that the water users of the Salt River project have borne a great financial burden all the time during the past 10 years, if he will understand that the Government did not hand over to them a completed project, and that they were of necessity compelled to complete it with their own funds, he will not have the temerity to again assert, as he did during the hearings, that they have obtained vast benefits without effort or expense on their part.

I can understand how the gentleman and others who have made similar assertions have fallen into this error. They read the annual reports of the Director of the Reclamation Service and note that over \$10,000,000 has been expended by the United States, of which only \$600,000 has been repaid, and then jump to the conclusion that the water users of the Salt River project have not done their full duty toward the Government. But let us look at the situation of the individual water user on that project. What he is interested in is not so much how the money is divided after it is collected from him, but the total amount which he has to pay each year.

The last annual report of the United States Reclamation Service shows that during the past three years there has been collected from the water users of the Salt River project in assessments the total sum of \$2,246,726, of which \$610,717 was paid to the Government for the purpose of reimbursing the reclamation fund for the cost of the construction of the project. It is not a fair statement of the financial relationship between the water users and the Reclamation Service to mention nothing except this \$610,000 and to utterly ignore the more than \$2,000,000 which these same farmers have also contributed to the improvement of an uncompleted project.

The fact that the water users of the Salt River project have been able to pay these large assessments is conclusive proof that the Salt River project is a financial and economic success. The farmers on that project have suffered the same hardships as the producers of agricultural products elsewhere in the United States due to the great deflation in prices, but under

ordinary conditions they can and will bring wealth from the soil sufficient to meet all of their future obligations to the Government.

The results that have thus far been obtained on the Salt River project completely justify a continuation of the reclamation of arid lands as a great national policy. The water users of the Salt River Valley are fully aware of the fact that all of the money which they repay to the reclamation fund is immediately used toward providing water for the irrigation of other lands in the West, where other American citizens are creating homes in what was once a desert. They are anxious to see this good work continue and can be counted upon to do their full share, as they have in the past, toward the accomplishment of this most beneficent purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not understand that the gentleman can reserve any time.

Mr. HAYDEN. I supposed that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], who is not present at the moment, might want to use some time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves five minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will ask the Chair to remind me when I have used 14 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the pending bill, which provides for carrying on all the activities of the Department of the Interior, appears for the second time in its present form, the second year in which the present policy has been followed. Naturally the bill carries many items of very great interest to the Members of the House and particularly to Members from the West, and it is easy to see that there can be a wide difference of opinion as to the wisdom of the amounts passed by the committee.

That has been illustrated this morning by the vigorous attack made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] upon the appropriations for the Indian Service, which he characterizes as entirely too large and as amounts which should be wiped out wholly, and, on the other hand, the protest of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that in many cases we have not gone beyond the figures presented by the Budget Bureau. I want to take a minute in which to say this: It has been the desire of the subcommittee who framed this bill to keep in mind always that there confronts the Treasury of the United States to-day, as much as at any time in the last three or four years and as much as at any time in the history of the Government, the need for absolute economy. It is necessary, as the President pointed out in his message accompanying the Budget, to keep even our expenditures below our receipts. We can not afford now to provide any new taxes, and the only alternative is to see that the appropriations made by this Congress are within the estimated revenues of the Government. And in order to accomplish that purpose of securing the greatest measure of economy with the proper conduct of the Government the Congress a year or two ago organized the Budget Bureau, not as a puppet to be knocked down but as the servant of Congress to aid in carrying into effect its policy of retrenchment.

Having been created for that purpose, and having secured the services of a gentleman as the head of the Budget Bureau, General Lord, who is performing his duty in an admirable and successful way, it is the duty of this subcommittee, and the duty of the House as well, to give their support and indorsement to his work. The aim of the subcommittee has been to supplement the economies that the Budget has recommended, rather than to do away with and defeat the economies that it has indorsed. Hence the occasions where the amounts recommended by the Budget have been increased by the committee have been very rare indeed.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] made a vigorous attack upon the expenditures for the Indians. The Indian problem has been one that has been with the Government for many generations. In fact, since Columbus first touched our shores the problem has been what should be done by the white race with the race that originally owned this continent. It is a problem in the working out of which there have been many mistakes, and it is not the province of the subcommittee to defend all those who have made mistakes. The Congress has created agencies and policies have been adopted, and I think it is safe to say that never in our history has there been any one at the head of the Indian Bureau who has been trying more conscientiously to economize with the money of the people of the



country and at the same time to do the utmost for the final working out of this problem than Mr. Burke, who is now Commissioner of Indian Affairs. [Applause.]

The appropriations at present for the Indian Bureau are only about \$7,191,000—the gratuity items. Those are items that are not paid for by the Indians and are not reimbursable. The gentleman from Pennsylvania would make us understand that we are making these appropriations mount constantly to greater figures, but in 1920 they were \$7,501,095 and in the bill before us they are only \$7,191,375. The gratuity items and the reimbursable items total together about \$10,000,000. For schools and education the appropriations are between \$4,000,000 and \$5,000,000.

Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania have the Government cease to educate the Indian, to make him capable of self-support? For irrigation \$2,500,000 is appropriated. Would the gentleman have us try to turn the Indian adrift without industrial preparation? For administration, we appropriate \$3,000,000 for caring for several hundred thousand Indians. Medical relief, \$370,000. The gentleman's speech carried to its logical conclusion would mean the elimination of that item altogether.

What are we doing with the Indians now? Are we making any progress? Are we adopting any better methods? There are now 43,000 Indians cultivating 900,000 acres of land themselves as against only 20,000, 10 years ago cultivating 550,000 acres.

The number of full-blood Indians has increased from 160,000 in 1912 to 165,000 now. The total property of the Indians amounts to about \$1,000,000,000.

The death rate in 1913 was 32 to the thousand and in 1920 only 22 to the thousand. The first hospital that we provided for the Indians was in 1882. Now there are 78 hospitals that treated 20,000 Indians last year.

In 1911, only about 10 years ago, \$40,000 was the total appropriation for the health of the Indians. Now it amounts to \$370,000.

There are 20,000 Indian children not in the schools. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] says we should wipe out all those schools and turn the Indian children adrift. Yet he complains that there are as many as 20,000 now adrift. Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I regret that I can not. I gave the gentleman more time than I reserved for myself. This year there are 3,000 more Indian children in school than there were a year ago, and this bill to which the gentleman objects because it is increased in amount provides for taking care of more of those 20,000 children that are adrift than ever were provided for before. The gentleman protests against this bill as too large, and the only increases in it are for education, to provide more school facilities for the Indians, and for increased irrigation to provide for their industrial preparedness.

As to that irrigation, only those items have been considered that are already under construction and that need to be completed in order to make some use of money heretofore appropriated. Only those projects have been considered either by the Indian Office or by this subcommittee.

Let me say this one word as to the success in educating the Indians. Commissioner Burke says there can not be any question about the benefits of education among the Indians; that that policy is necessary to make them self-supporting. Read his statement in the hearings. Mr. Burke lived for years in the West. He was 10 years in this House, and was head of the Committee on Indian Affairs of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] is now a member, and since he has been Indian Commissioner he has visited practically every school and reservation except those in Oklahoma. He knows what he is talking about. Read his indorsement of the success of education among the Indians. Then if you are not satisfied with that, take the indorsement of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER], himself of Indian blood. There is no man in the country better fitted to discuss that subject, and he gives unqualified indorsement to the program of Indian education. [Applause.]

In the few minutes I have I can only touch upon one or two other activities which are provided for in this bill, those which I think most interesting to the House.

The bill also carries the appropriation for pensions. You will be interested to know that 21 years ago our pension roll had the largest number of pensioners upon it of any time in the history of our pension legislation. In 1902 there were 999,446 persons on the pension roll. Still it was not until 1921 that the amount spent for pensions was the greatest, and that was \$260,110,747.22. Even that was not the peak,

because the Bursum bill that is just about to become a law will cause us to spend next year, in 1924, between \$300,000,000 and \$400,000,000 for pensions.

The pensioners of the Civil War are particularly close to the hearts of Members of Congress. In 1918 the number of them on the rolls was 591,793. Death has so rapidly cut their ranks that in 1922 they were reduced to 468,075, and they are going at the rate of more than 20,000 a month.

The Patent Office is another activity of the Interior Department. In 1919, three years ago, the total number of patent applications was 62,735. Last year that number was increased to 88,243, 40.6 per cent increase. Applications with reference to designs increased from 2,787 to 5,645, or a 102 per cent increase. Trade-mark applications increased from 8,561 to 17,029, an increase of 99 per cent. Still the showing made before this committee was that the Patent Office, with that tremendous increase in the number of applications and some increase in clerical force, is making gains upon its work of catching up, and the gains are even entirely beyond the increased personnel given to that office.

The Bureau of Education carries only \$644,000 in the pending bill, an increase of only \$23,000. That bureau touches all of the educational facilities of the country, the millions of school children, and your subcommittee are satisfied that the new Commissioner of Education is a man who has put great judgment and energy into the discharge of the duties of his office and that the money will be well expended.

The question of reclamation is one that is of great interest to the country, particularly to the West. The policy of this committee this year is the same as last year. Its policy was adopted this year by the Budget Office; that is, the policy of making appropriations in such an amount that the people of the West who are interested in these projects can feel sure that the work will be done for which appropriations are made. Before the appropriations were so large an amount the reclamation fund had insufficient money coming in, and hence there was often disappointment and complaint. We are satisfied there will be money enough in the fund for which we are appropriating and that the work here provided for will be carried on.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CRAMTON. Very briefly.

Mr. CLARKE of New York. What is the total amount in the fund?

Mr. CRAMTON. The appropriation is \$12,250,000. In connection with this your committee are fully satisfied of the importance of the reclamation work and of its success; but I want to sound a word of warning to the West represented by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and others, that they who seek from Congress a great advance in reclamation, who seek money to be appropriated by Congress for this purpose, might better put their reclamation work on a business basis. [Applause.] Let the money that Congress appropriates bear interest if they want to borrow from the Government. Let them borrow the money of the Government at a lower rate of interest than they can get it anywhere else, but let it bear interest, and having borrowed that money let them pay it back at some time.

In connection with that I want to call your attention to one fact. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] spoke about the Salt River project and felt that we had not been entirely fair as to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. CRAMTON. I want only one minute for this. On page 61 of the hearings the Director of Reclamation says there was a dependable water supply available on the Salt River project in 1910, but the first public notice was not given until 1917, seven years thereafter, and no payments became due until such public notice.

And still this chart [pointing] shows that the Salt River project has produced in farm values more than any other reclamation project in the country, including the famous \$1.25-a-pound cotton in war-time periods. Here is a representation of the construction cost that has been repaid, less than \$1,000,000 on a cost of \$10,000,000 to the Government. But the commodities produced run to \$81,000,000. Why under heaven's name should not they be paying back to the Government the money to be used for other reclamation projects? The same and probably more could be said of the Uncompahgre project shown down here. There are farm products worth \$16,000,000 on a \$6,000,000 construction cost, and not one red cent has been paid back into the Treasury.



Now the Alaskan Railroad is included. We have provided for that and its completion of construction and for the deficit estimated in its operation. We feel that the railroad is making a favorable showing under the difficulties it faces, and I regret that the opportunity does not give me time to go into the details, but those will be reached later on in the bill.

The total of the bill provides an expenditure of \$294,265,300—a reduction of \$2,241,765 under the current year's expenditure and \$1,092,000 below the estimate of the Budget. We are glad to have been able to supplement the work of the Budget to that extent and hope to have the indorsement of the House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.  
SALARIES.

Secretary of the Interior, \$12,000; First Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; Assistant Secretary, \$4,500; chief clerk, who shall be chief executive officer of the department and who may be designated by the Secretary to sign official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary and Assistant Secretaries, \$3,500; assistant to the Secretary, \$2,750; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; assistant attorney, \$2,500; two special inspectors (whose employment shall be limited to the inspection of offices and the work in the several offices under the control of the department), at \$2,500 each; 6 inspectors, at \$2,500 each; chief disbursing clerk, \$2,500; chiefs of divisions—1 of supplies, \$2,250, 1 of appointments, mails, and files, \$2,250, and 1 of publications, \$2,250; expert accountant, \$2,000; clerks—4 at \$2,000 each, 12 of class 4, 2 at \$1,740 each, 14 of class 3, 20 of class 2, 1 \$1,320, 20 of class 1, 1 \$1,140, 3 at \$1,000 each; returns office clerk, \$1,000; female clerk, to be designated by the President, to sign land patents, \$1,200; 8 copyists, at \$900 each; multigraph operator, \$900; assistant multigraph operator, \$720; 2 telephone switchboard operators, at \$720 each; automobile mechanic, \$1,400; chauffeurs—1 \$1,080, 8 at \$720 each; 12 messengers, at \$840 each; 6 assistant messengers, at \$720 each; laborers—3 at \$660 each, 1 \$600; messenger boys—1 \$540, 3 at \$420 each; 5 packers, at \$660 each; clerk to sign, under the direction of the Secretary, in his name and for him his approval of all tribal deeds to allottees and deeds for town lots made and executed according to law for any of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in the Indian Territory, \$1,200; in all, \$221,520.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do so to inquire about the reduction in the salary of the chief clerk of the Interior Department. I understand there has been a cut of \$500 in the pay of Mr. Harvey.

Mr. CRAMTON. The chief clerk has heretofore had \$4,000, which included \$500 as superintendent of buildings. Last year the custody of the four large buildings of that department was transferred from the Interior to the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Buildings, and that transfer is to be continued. These duties being no longer incumbent upon Mr. Harvey as superintendent, we felt that the \$500 that went with it should be dropped out.

Mr. HAYDEN. How does this salary compare with the salaries of the chief clerks of other departments?

Mr. CRAMTON. The chief clerk of the State Department has \$3,000. The chief clerk of the War Department has \$4,000. The chief clerk of the Navy Department has \$3,000. The chief clerk of the Treasury Department has \$4,000. The chief clerk of the Post Office Department has \$4,000. The chief clerk of the Department of Justice has \$3,500, and the chief clerk of the Agricultural Department has \$3,500. The chief clerk of the Department of Commerce has \$3,000, and the chief clerk of the Department of Labor has \$3,000. There are three departments where the chief clerk has a salary higher than \$3,500.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is it not true that in the three departments where the salary is \$4,000 the chief clerks have no more important duties or greater responsibilities than in this department? Does it not require the same degree of ability to be the chief clerk of the Interior Department as is required in the War Department, the Treasury Department, and the Post Office Department?

Mr. CRAMTON. The committee felt that \$3,500 was in keeping with the ability of the gentleman and the responsibility that he has.

Mr. HAYDEN. The chief clerk of the Interior Department has as responsible a position as that of any other chief clerk. It seems to me to be exceedingly small to make a cut of \$500 in a salary which has been paid for many years merely because a very minor duty has been done away with. If it was true that he had been relieved of a large part of his duties that might justify the reduction. But when he has practically the same work and the same responsibilities, I think he should retain the full salary. Where is the place in the bill that this salary is provided for? Apparently it is in line 8, page 2.

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out on line 8, page 2, the figures \$3,500 and inserting \$4,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out \$3,500 and insert \$4,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF SOLICITOR.

Salaries: Three members of a board of appeals, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, at \$4,000 each; assistant attorneys—1 \$3,000, 2 at \$2,750 each, 4 at \$2,500 each, 7 at \$2,250 each, 11 at \$2,000 each; medical expert, \$2,000; clerks—1 of class 4, 6 of class 3 (1 of whom shall act as stenographer and 1 of whom shall be a stenographer and typewriter), 3 of class 2, 1 of class 1; copyist, \$900; messenger, \$840; 3 assistant messengers, at \$720 each; in all, \$90,950.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to call the attention of the chairman to the fact that for this office of solicitor in the paragraph just read there is allowed the sum of \$90,950. That is in keeping with the rule with regard to almost every department of the Government. They are gradually year after year building up a system of having an enormous force of legal advisers in every bureau of their own department irrespective of access to the legal advice in other departments of the Government and their access to the Department of Justice legal experts, an army of which we have provided. I want to call the chairman's attention to this provision where we provide three members of a board of appeals, at \$4,000 each per year, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, which has been carried in the bill heretofore. Just what function does this board of appeals perform? I notice that you passed over this \$90,500,000 in the hearings with just a casual observation.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that that has been in the bill for a great many years. These appeals are taken from various bureaus to the Secretary and are mostly Land Office matters, as I now recall.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman knows that in the Land Office a proper appeal is there provided for and they have legal advisers in the Land Office.

Mr. CARTER. When they come here they have the right to appeal to the Secretary, and it goes to the board of appeals. I expect my friend from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] can give better information in relation to this subject than I can.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. FRENCH. For a great many years there has been something of a controversy in the West as to whether or not land disputes should be handled in separate land courts or handled by the registrars and receivers of land offices in the first instance, then with permission of appeal to the commissioner's office, and permission of appeal from there to the Secretary of the Interior. From the decision of the Secretary of the Interior appeal may be made to the Federal courts. There has been a very strong contention on the part of many that this matter of appeal from the registrars and receivers should go direct to some kind of land court, as has been suggested. However, the sentiment in favor of it has not been controlling, and the Congress has not provided the separate land court; but we do have in the Interior Department what might be called two courts. One of them is in connection with the office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office—

Mr. BLANTON. That was the point that I called attention to, as I thought the one there sufficient.

Mr. FRENCH. And the other one under the Secretary of the Interior and to which reference is made here. This board is made up of men of very high class, who are thoroughly familiar with the public land laws, and I refer to the public land laws especially, because the bulk of the work that this board has to do arises from the public-land litigations throughout the United States. This board is made up of high-class men, and it helps the department to steer a consistent course touching the patenting of the public domain under the various land laws and the adjudication of rights that arise under the various laws of the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. If I understand the gentleman, he admits that the controversies arise first in the registrar and receiver's office?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, I would say—

Mr. BLANTON. And then they are passed on to the land commissioner's office. There he has a force of legal experts who pass on the controversy, and they decide the matter by affirming or setting aside the award. And they are provided with another appellate court, as it were, in this board of appeals in the Secretary's office?

Mr. COLTON. If the gentleman will permit, it is really the supreme court of the Interior Department.



Mr. BLANTON. We are having too many supreme courts in the various departments of the Government.

Mr. FRENCH. Let me make this suggestion, that while I said that the registrar and receiver are charged with the first responsibility for the most part, there is no controversy. For the most part the entries that are made pass on to final patent and consummation without any controversy.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, yes; and the gentleman is sufficiently familiar with the business of the Public Land Office to know that most of the controversies are settled in the registrar and receivers' office in the first instance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Most of these controversies are settled in the first instance in the office of the registrar and receiver, but the ones that fail of settlement there go on up through this system of appeals. There is too much duplication. I take it that we ought to have but one appellate tribunal in this department. The one in the Land Office ought to be sufficient. Then, if we are to permit the parties aggrieved to go to any other court, we ought to force them to carry their appeals to the courts of the land for final adjudication, as is now done in some States, like Texas.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken; they have no rights to go into the courts at all. The disposition of public land is in the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior. He can let a man obtain a patent or not. The man can not go to the court and get a patent.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not talking about getting a patent, but about getting a final judgment in a court.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not with respect to the disposition of public lands. That is an administrative function, and the duty devolves on the Secretary of the Interior, and this board of appeals provides the law for the Secretary.

Mr. BLANTON. And after all they have a final supreme arbiter in the gentleman's committee by coming to Congress, and the gentleman from Arizona takes care of them by bringing in special bills, most of which he gets through because he stands up here and fights for them until he does get them through.

The point that I am making is that we are having too many attorneys in every single department of this Government. Besides having numerous legal experts in the Land Office, I call attention to the fact that in the Secretary's office, under this heading of solicitor, we have three persons appointed by the Secretary of the Interior at \$4,000 each; assistant attorneys—1 at \$3,000, which is the salary of a circuit judge in many of the States, 2 lawyers at \$2,750 each, 4 lawyers at \$2,500 each, 7 lawyers at \$2,250 each, and 11 lawyers at \$2,000 each. They are supposed to be legal experts, and many additional ones are provided for other bureaus in this department; and I want to tell you the practice is growing in every single department and bureau of this Government, and if we do not watch out we never will be able to collect enough taxes to pay the expenses of the Government.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. The gentleman would not have the Secretary of the Interior the final arbiter in the Land Office without giving him a legal department to settle the questions?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, certainly he has another legal department in the Land Office.

Mr. COLTON. That is under the supervision of the commissioner.

Mr. BLANTON. How many legal departments do we want? In the gentleman's State, if it is anything like my own, he has a court of appeals and a supreme court, and that is the end of it.

Mr. COLTON. That is it, exactly. The registrar and receivers, of course, may be compared to the justice of the peace court. Then you have your district court.

Mr. BLANTON. But that is in substance the trial court—the register and receivers' office—because all of the facts are developed in the proceedings held in that office. Then they go to the Land Office for review, and there it ought to end.

Mr. COLTON. I think the gentleman is not quite right. The registrar and receiver are not authorized to make final decisions. They make recommendations.

Mr. BLANTON. It is after all really the trial court, because the facts are developed there upon which the whole controversy is to be finally determined.

Mr. COLTON. But they simply act as referees and make recommendations to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, so that is really the first course.

Mr. BLANTON. I repeat what I said in the beginning. I believe we are having too many lawyers in most of these bureaus and departments of the Government, and I think the committees ought to watch each bureau every time they frame an appropriation bill. Now in the hearings this whole item of \$90,950 was dismissed with just one little careless observation from one member of the committee. He asked one question about this great department of lawyers costing \$90,950 of the people's money, and the matter was then dismissed, and the committee passed on to something else. Our committee, I think, ought to watch this legal expert part of all the bureaus in every single bill which they bring in here.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I have already indicated the procedure followed in connection with land matters. I make this further observation, that the registers and receivers are not necessarily lawyers. Oftentimes they are not lawyers, and as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. COLTON] said, they act rather in the capacity of referees in obtaining the information upon which the office of Commissioner of the General Land Office acts.

Again, the work of this board of appeals in the Secretary's office does not confine itself altogether to the work of the Land Office. While that is a large part of the work, yet there are many bureaus under the Department of the Interior, and from the best legal advice within these different bureaus appeals are sometimes made. The Patent Office, for instance, is an important one, and the Pension Office is an important one, and the Mining Bureau is an important one. It is true that the Commissioner of the General Land Office is given legal advice and a board to assist him in decisions, yet that board has to do with land matters alone, whereas this board of appeals has to do with appeals taken from the different bureaus on matters upon which the Secretary of the Interior himself must, under the law, pass, and he is charged with this great responsibility.

Let me make this further observation: The board of appeals has so much work to do that until the last few years one of the greatest complaints throughout the West was about the tardiness with which that board was able to pass upon decisions to be made by the office of the Secretary. The department was two or three years behind. The Land Office work was congested in the land offices and congested in the board that was responsible to the Secretary; and your committee is satisfied that just now, although the work is being brought more nearly current than it has been for many years past, it presents such a demand upon the Government in cases that ought to be heard expeditiously that we can not at this time reduce the item.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, my attention was drawn to this item of \$68,250 and the language of this paragraph, and it struck me that there is a great plethora of lawyers, composed of clerks and solicitors and assistant attorneys, of which there are 11 at \$2,000 each. I have heard a great deal about the skill and the qualifications of lawyers, but I wonder how they are able to employ lawyers at \$2,000 each whose advice and legal knowledge is worth anything. I would like if the chairman of the subcommittee would explain, so that we at least understand it better—myself and other members of the committee.

It was stated and admitted by the members of the committee that this department was handling appeals where the evidence was assembled in the Land Office. It looks to me as if it were a duplication of the provision on page 8, under the title of the General Land Office. You will find there an assistant commissioner at \$3,500, a chief clerk at \$3,000, a chief law clerk at \$2,500, and two law clerks at \$2,200. It seemed to me that there was a duplication of work, and it is stated there that there are three law examiners under the surveyors general and district land offices—the same identical functions that are said to be performed by the lawyers whose aggregate salaries amount to \$68,250 on page 3 under the title of "Office of the solicitor." Is



that right? Can the gentleman from Idaho tell us? Is that a duplication?

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the committee has tried to guard against duplication, and I am of opinion that there is no duplication of work along the line the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE] has suggested. In the bill we carried several items under the heading of assistant attorneys—1 at \$3,000, 2 at \$2,750, 4 at \$2,500, and 7 at \$2,250.

The gentleman must know that the more numerous of these classes referred to are lawyers who are qualified largely as clerks, as well as attorneys, who at this time are giving their time essentially to assisting the more responsible attorneys in the department who pass upon the decisions, briefing the decisions, maybe, looking up citations, maybe, briefing citations, it may be, doing work that must fall upon as high a class of attorney clerk as can be employed by the bureau as assistants to the more responsible board of appeals or the more responsible attorneys connected with the office.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there further?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I wanted to say also that these clerks and attorneys are engaged in answering correspondence from Congressmen and from people all over the country, and giving them legal opinions to help them in their private letters.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I think the gentleman is right, absolutely right, on account of some of the things I have had from this department. They must have been written by \$2,000 men, or even \$1,000 men, because it would seem to me you could not employ any lawyer who had any efficiency or competency who could be guilty of writing such letters. I do not see how you could get a competent lawyer for \$2,000, unless he wanted to eke out a little money to assist him through a law school here—at the George Washington University, for example—which would be a commendable thing. But I find myself wondering and still wondering, although it is not strictly pertinent to this subject, how long it would take for one of these \$2,000 men to graduate into a \$30,000 man with the Shipping Board. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. About five minutes. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### CONTINGENT EXPENSES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

For contingent expenses of the office of the Secretary and the bureaus, offices, and buildings of the department; furniture, carpets, ice, lumber, hardware, dry goods, advertising, telegraphing, street-car fares not exceeding \$250, and expressage; for the purchase for the use of the Secretary of the Interior, at a cost not to exceed \$5,000, of one passenger-carrying automobile to replace one present passenger-carrying automobile, which may be exchanged or traded in part payment thereof; not exceeding \$500 shall be available for the payment of damages caused to private property by department motor vehicles exclusive of those operated by the Government fuel yards; purchase and exchange of motor trucks, motor cycles, and bicycles, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles and motor trucks, motor cycles, and bicycles, to be used only for official purposes; diagrams, awnings, filing and labor-saving devices; constructing model and other cases and furniture; and other absolutely necessary expenses not hereinbefore provided for, including traveling expenses, fuel and lights, typewriting and labor-saving machines, \$79,200.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 3, beginning with line 25, the following language:

For the purchase for the use of the Secretary of the Interior, at a cost not to exceed \$5,000, of one passenger-carrying automobile to replace one present passenger-carrying automobile, which may be exchanged or traded in part payment thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLANTON: Page 3, line 25, after the semicolon strike out the remainder of line 25, and all of lines 1, 2, and 3, to and including the word "thereof" in line 4, on page 4.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, after the war ceased I was hopeful that we would stop the habit of granting \$5,000 automobiles to various of our public officers. I think we ought to quit it. We pay our Cabinet officers \$12,000 a year, or \$4,500 more than a Representative or Senator gets. Then we grant them these \$5,000 cars, and maintenance, and then they draft a civil employee, who draws another salary from the Government, to drive the car for them in many cases. This provision shows conclusively that the Secretary already has a car furnished by the Government. It has not been long since it was bought. If the committee will look it up they will see that it has been used by him only a comparatively short time. Yet this \$5,000 is not to buy a new car, but it is just to pay the difference between his present car and a new one in exchange. I have a car, which I had to pay for myself, that I have been using a couple of years. It stands over at the House Office Building every day,

out in the weather, and, of course, it was not looking very good. So I took it to the Studebaker Co. down here to see what they would allow me for it in exchange for a new one. They said they could allow me only \$500 for it. That is all they would allow me, but I took it to an expert painter and paid him \$50, and he painted it for me, and it now looks just as good as a new one and I am going to drive it two more years. I should think maybe the Secretary could have his car painted up, and it would not cost this Government \$5,000 more in exchange. I am not picayunish. I believe in fellows spending their own money just as extravagantly as they want to, but I do not think we ought to spend this \$5,000 of public money to enable our Secretary of the Interior to exchange his car, when the money comes out of the people's taxes. We ought to quit it. How long are we going to keep it up? It is just a continual increase of the number of officers for whom we allow these cars. I think the time has come when we ought to pin right down and cut them off. Let them furnish their own cars. Let them furnish everything else that other people furnish. Pay them their salaries, but when we pay them their salaries let us stop and not just keep adding these extras year after year. I think it ought to go out.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I will only say that the only thing furnished to the Department of the Interior was an authorization for the department to secure one from the War Department. The statement set forth in the hearings is that when the Interior Department endeavored to obtain the new Cadillac, pursuant to the appropriation act, they were informed that there were no new cars on hand, but that a used limousine could be obtained at Camp Holabird or that a touring car could be had at Camp Jeffersonville, Ind. On delivery of the latter car it was found that it had been used very slightly, but that it is a very old model, paint badly worn, and aged, and that it is such an old type that the wheels, tires, and most of the principal parts are entirely different from the present Cadillac models. Your committee has simply desired to give this Cabinet officer the same courtesy that has been extended to other Cabinet officials.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. The list price of a new Cadillac touring car, if I am not mistaken, is now \$2,485, delivered. Yet we are proposing to allow the Secretary of the Interior \$5,000 cash to use in exchanging his present car for a new one.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 9, noes 11.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the chairman [Mr. CRAMTON] of the subcommittee in charge of this bill made reference in a disparaging manner to the Uncompahgre Valley reclamation project, one of the two Government irrigation projects in my congressional district in the State of Colorado. Referring first to the Salt River project in Arizona, he said:

Here is a representation of the construction cost that has been repaid, less than \$1,000,000 on a cost of \$10,000,000 to the Government. But the commodities produced run to \$81,000,000. Why under heaven's name should not they be paying back to the Government the money to be used for other reclamation projects? The same and probably more could be said of the Uncompahgre project shown down here. There are farm products worth \$16,000,000 on a \$6,000,000 construction cost, and not one red cent has been paid back into the Treasury.

And at the hearing before this subcommittee some six pages (pages 612 to 618) are given to an examination of Director Davis and an arraignment of the settlers under these two projects for not repaying to the Government the cost of their construction.

I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I allowed those expressions to remain in the Record without a word of explanation. The history of the Uncompahgre Valley project would make several large volumes. Much of it would not be a happy record. I, of course, will not attempt to recite it but I want to mention just a few matters briefly to give some little idea of the viewpoint of the settlers under that project.

The Uncompahgre Valley project is in Montrose and Delta Counties. My home is in the adjoining county of Garfield. I have lived right beside and among those people for nearly 40 years, and I personally know the entire history of that project, and the long years and hard struggles, hardships, privations, and discouraging disappointments of the people under that project ever since it was started, some 15 years ago. I think that reclamation project was the first one started by the Government in the United States. Soon after the United States reclamation law was enacted on June 17, 1902, there



was an agitation commenced to induce the Government to create that reclamation project and construct a tunnel 6 miles long through a high mountain, to divert the water from the Gunnison River over into the Uncompahgre Valley. The Gunnison is a large river with an abundance of unappropriated water.

The Uncompahgre Valley at that time was fairly well settled, and the people were fairly prosperous. But there was not sufficient water in the Uncompahgre River to practically irrigate all of that valley, and the settlers desired to have the Government build that large Gunnison tunnel to a capacity of 1,200 cubic feet of water per second of time, and turn it from the Gunnison River into that valley to supplement the water rights which the settlers then had. In other words, give them more water and a better water right.

The Reclamation Service, through their engineers, made a thorough investigation of the project and decided that it was perfectly practical that the tunnel could be built and that vast amount of water furnished to the settlers at a charge or cost of \$17 per acre, and promised a maximum cost of not to exceed \$25 per acre. That was the original official estimate of the engineers and the official, publicly announced and widely advertised, inducement held out by the Government to the then settlers and also to all prospective settlers. That \$25 per acre cost limit was put in the contract. The project was intended to cover about 140,000 acres of land, of which fully 100,000 acres was represented to be good land and practically irrigable under the project.

The Uncompahgre Valley is naturally one of the richest valleys in the world. The land is the finest kind of soil. The climate is as healthful and good as can be found anywhere under the shining sun. The altitude is about the same as Denver, and it is an ideal country for practically all kinds of fruit and agricultural products that can be raised anywhere throughout the Temperate Zone. There is everything there for a thoroughly practical reclamation project. In fact, it is a perfectly legitimate and splendid project. And the people were all delighted to have the Government accept the project and let the contract for the construction of that tunnel.

The first main contract was let to the celebrated contractors, Orman & Crook, who had a wide reputation as being one of the best engineering contracting firms in the country. The senior member, the Hon. James B. Orman, was the governor of our State.

Those contractors encountered all kinds of obstacles—hot water, bad air, more difficult rock formations, and other utterly unlooked for conditions that no one could foretell, and they practically lost the savings of a lifetime trying to build that tunnel, and went completely bankrupt and were compelled to give it up. Thereupon the Reclamation Service took the matter up and undertook to construct the tunnel themselves by employing day labor. That turned out to be a disastrously expensive experiment. In fact, this first project is now required to pay for many expensive governmental experiments that other projects are now getting the benefit of. However, the Government engineers finally, in the fall of 1909, declared the tunnel completed, and President Taft went out there to attend the opening and dedicate the tunnel. The President very kindly accorded me the honor and pleasure of riding with him across the State on his special train to attend that opening. There was a vast crowd of people and the President made one of his memorable, happy, and splendid speeches. And the people were all buoyant, optimistic, hopeful, and happy. But, alas, their illusions were soon dispelled. It first developed that instead of carrying 1,200 or more cubic feet of water per second, the tunnel did not then, and never has since, and will not now, carry 75 per cent of that expected amount of water. And regardless of what anybody may say or figure out theoretically, the actual irrigators under that project have always and do now insist that the tunnel does not carry sufficient water, and that they never have had during the dry seasons the sufficient quantity of water that was promised them.

But that was only the beginning of their disappointments and troubles. There had to be many adjustments made between both the old and the new settlers and the Reclamation Service. Some of the settlers had sufficient water, others had only partly sufficient, while others had none. Consequently there ensued years and years of jangling and bickering back and forth between the settlers and the Government officials as to a fair adjustment of their respective rights and obligations, and the charges that should be imposed and paid for, between the Reclamation Service and the people. There was great delay and trouble in bringing in the older canals and ditches in the valley and unifying the canal systems, and the Government

finally decided to buy up most if not all of these old canals, ditches, and laterals.

Moreover, the mere running of the water through the tunnel and turning it from the Gunnison River over into the Uncompahgre Valley was not sufficient, and it became necessary to build two very large, long, and expensive canals and some smaller ones, and the Government undertook that additional construction. And that cost a vast amount more than was expected. The canals ran many miles through gypsum foothills. Gypsum will not hold water and the canals had to be concreted. The reclamation officials used, or permitted to be used, inferior cement that the alkali dissolved, and it all had to be largely rebuilt. That was another lesson to the Reclamation Service that was most awfully expensive and for which these people must now pay. About the 1st of April, 1917, about the time we declared war against Germany, the Reclamation Service announced that on June 1, 1917, they would open up the project and begin to collect construction cost. The settlers vigorously protested and sent a committee of prominent citizens down here to Washington, as is stated by Director Davis in the hearings before the subcommittee. At that time the Reclamation Service intended to open the project on a cost basis of \$60 per acre.

That committee demonstrated conclusively to Secretary Lane of the Interior Department, and he very justly decided that the project was not completed or in proper condition to be opened and that the Government had not fulfilled its contract or proper obligations to the settlers, and that there was a large amount of work that the Government should perform before it would be in a position in good faith to require or expect the settlers to commence paying the cost of construction by the 20 annual payments. Secretary Lane conducted an extensive hearing and made a thorough investigation of all the facts and conditions and formally decided that it would not be acting in good faith or fairly, but it would be unconscionable and outrageous to declare that project open until such time as very much further adjustment, development, and construction was accomplished. Those water users under the project and, in fact, everybody else in western Colorado very naturally hoped and believed that that decision of Secretary Lane settled the matter. No one ever dreamed that those settlers would be criticized year in and year out thereafter and their motives impugned, and they bitterly resent these nagging, petty, and utterly unjust accusations and reinvestigations of that matter.

Moreover, the people were in no condition whatever financially to commence paying the construction charges in 1917. It was all they could do to pay—which they were doing and ever since have done—the annual cost of operation and maintenance. The Government has charged and collected from them \$80 a year for every cubic foot of that water. Those people have been paying for all the water they have ever received during all of these years, which has been a heavy burden upon many of them most of the time at that rate.

The settlers insisted upon, and made such a complete showing that Secretary Lane decided that it would be at least five years under the then existing conditions, and in view of the difficulty of reclaiming the lands and settling the ditches and canals, before the Government would be warranted in declaring the project completed and open for the payment of construction charges. And, moreover, it would be that long in all probability before the settlers would be in financial position to commence paying the construction charges in addition to their annual operation and maintenance charges. That was the formal decision and official order of Secretary Lane rendered the latter part of May, 1917. No Secretary of the Interior in the history of this Government ever rendered a more honest, or meritorious, or justifiable, or humane, or even absolutely necessary judgment than that decision of Secretary Lane. If he had not so decided, further construction would have ceased. It would have meant confiscation of a very large part of the valley. Many of the settlers would have been compelled to move off the project. It would have been a monstrous wrong; and those two wonderfully rich counties, Delta and Montrose, would have relapsed practically back to where they were before the Reclamation Service was ever heard of. Fortunately Secretary Lane, who was one of the greatest men that this generation has produced in this or any other country, was big enough and broad enough to fully realize that impending disaster, and was honest and courageous enough to prevent it.

I have forgotten the exact amount that had been expended at the time of that extension; but my recollection is that it was something over \$5,000,000.

That that extension of time was both necessary and just is proved by the subsequent facts that the Government has ex-



pending something over a million dollars on the project and toward completing it since that extension was made in May, 1917.

So at the present time it is correct, as reported in the hearings and by the department, that over \$6,700,000 has been expended by the Government, and no part of it has been repaid to the Government. But no fair-minded person who knows the conditions can say that that extension was unjust or unnecessary, or that the Government has been imposed upon in the slightest degree, or that the Government has in reality lost a dollar by reason of that extension. The Government has a blanket lien on that whole valley and holds all that 100,000 acres of rich land as security.

Instead of the Government requiring those settlers to pay \$25 an acre, as they originally were promised and agreed to, the charge is now \$70 per acre, and Secretary of the Interior Fall has officially fixed that amount as the price that those settlers must pay the Government for whatever amount of water that tunnel will carry. In other words, the Government figures on 100,000 acres of land at \$70 an acre, making a total of \$7,000,000, and is demanding the first one of the 20-year annual payments. That payment of \$1.40 per acre (besides the operation and maintenance charges) was due on the first day of this month. Those people are absolutely and utterly unable to make the first payment at this time and are now appealing for a further extension of time. On the 21st of last September I introduced a bill (H. R. 12780) providing for further extensions of five years more. The Interior Department was opposed to the bill, so I have now joined with the western Senators in support of the McNary bill (S. 4187), giving the Secretary discretionary authority to grant a further extension for two years.

In justice to the Director of the Reclamation Service, Mr. Davis, and the subcommittee that held those hearings, I should say that they all fully realized that the present year has been a most disastrous one to the settlers under that project—not through any fault whatever of the settlers, or lack of water, or through any fault of the Reclamation Service, or of the soil, or season, or the crops, but caused almost entirely by the deplorably inefficient service of the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad. A branch or side line of that road is the only railroad there is in that country. They have no other means of shipping out their products, and that branch during the past 10 months has practically failed to function as a railroad. It has been more like the Toonerville Trolley, especially the narrow-gauge section throughout southwestern Colorado. The road has had the shopmen's strike to contend with, and its rolling stock has been very badly run down. But, personally, I feel that the management of the road is so thoroughly incompetent that it amounts to a colossal crime upon that entire valley. As the Governor of the State of Colorado recently wrote to Secretary of the Interior Fall:

The condition of the people under the Uncompahgre reclamation project is pathetically appalling.

At page 615 of the hearings on this bill, on the 11th of this month, Director Davis said:

Mr. CRAMTON. But apart from the exceptional financial conditions of this time, is that project an unsuccessful project and one that should not have been developed?

Mr. DAVIS. Not by any means. It is a project where not only is the production great and successful agriculturally, but I think it is above the average of projects that could be obtained. I was recently there at the request of the people and there is no question but what that project is to-day in one of the worst conditions of any project or any region that I know of in the country; not due to any lack or failure of crops or of the water supply or anything except two items, the lack of price for their products and the lack of transportation; by far the greatest difficulty is the lack of transportation. The reports that were made to me, that appear to me well substantiated, are that the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad has practically collapsed as a means of transportation.

The operation of that railroad this year has been a cold-blooded calamity; in fact, a tragedy. It has utterly failed to furnish cars at the necessary time for the shipment of the fruit and potato crops, and hundreds and hundreds of carloads of the finest peaches, pears, apples, and plums that are grown anywhere in the world were left to rot upon the trees or upon the ground. Fruit and early potatoes and early onions and other summer and early fall perishable produce must be shipped in refrigerator cars. And about half of what cars the road did furnish were box cars and cattle cars, and nearly everything shipped in them was rotted and lost, and the shippers had to pay the freight besides. That valley has a wonderful reputation for a specially fine variety of early potatoes, and they supply the early markets throughout the country before other potatoes come in when they can secure transportation, and 3,000 cars of the finest potatoes in the world are to-day rotting in the ground and not harvested. That has caused financial ruination to hundreds of families. Fully 20 per cent of all the renters abandoned their crops, and the

owners of the land were left to harvest them if they cared to do so. The farmers on the project raised an enormous crop of those early potatoes, and the prices were high from August 1 to October 1 and fair up to October 15 this year. And while a few cars were furnished them, they were not furnished promptly or on time or at the proper time, but so irregularly and so uncertain that dealers could not rely upon them, and neither could the farmers, and therefore orders for over 400 carloads of fruit were compelled to be canceled and all that produce rotted. One of the main banks in Montrose suspended with 1,400 depositors. The banks, as everyone knows, very largely advance the money to the farmers to put in their crops, expecting to get their payments when the crops are harvested. And there have been, comparatively speaking, not sufficient crops harvested to anywhere near pay the cost of raising, and there is very little money and widespread loss and deplorable suffering.

A great many people are going to be bankrupt, and the valley has been dealt the most crushing blow in its entire history. And all of this, I repeat, is through no fault of the project or of the Reclamation Service, and certainly through no fault of the settlers. They have worked hard and have raised abundant crops, and have lost them. As everyone knows, this has been a bad year for farmers everywhere, and the prices are low, especially of potatoes; but if refrigerator cars had been furnished at the time the potatoes and fruit had to be shipped a very large part of that could have been sold and hundreds of people saved from ruinous loss. That railroad has for some 10 months been in the hands of a receiver under the control of the Federal court in Denver and the Interstate Commerce Commission here in Washington, and has in that way been practically operated under Government supervision, and that kind of operation, or lack of operation, has been the main outstanding cause of the financial assassination of that valley during the past summer and fall. Besides, there are other serious obstacles that must be considered, and from which the settlers are most justly entitled to and must have relief:

First. The freight rates on that travesty of a railroad are so excessively high that they are almost confiscatory and are prohibitive of practical farming in that valley at this time, and there is no earthly reason why they should not be reduced to such an amount that the farmers can pay. The freight is from 50 to 60 per cent of the selling price, but the farmers might possibly pay even that if they had any decent service and could market their crops.

Second. The high cost of farming in any irrigation district, especially under a Government reclamation project, where the cost per year per acre for water and excessive overhead charges is a very large and heavy burden.

Neither the Federal Farm Loan Board, the Federal reserve banks, nor any other Federal agency will loan these settlers under Government reclamation projects any money at a low rate or any rate of interest as other farmers throughout the United States can secure. The Government will not loan these settlers money upon any conditions whatever, so that they are deprived of all possibility of making necessary farm developments not only by the outrageous and infamous transportation situation but by the excessive high cost of the project and unreasonably high overhead cost, but are even denied the privilege of getting any Federal money to make developments. The Federal Farm Loan and War Finance Boards and all other Federal functions are an utter delusion, a mockery, and a sham, so far as these very needy people are concerned. In other words, the Government ties their hands with these insurmountable obstacles and then demands payments when there is no human possibility of making payments under the conditions that now prevail under that project.

The interest rate both on real estate and all other property is so exorbitantly high that it is almost prohibitive. Ninety per cent of all those farmers have chattel mortgages to almost the full extent of the value of their farming stock and machinery. The Government itself even charges these settlers 12 per cent per annum interest on all delinquent water payments, while at the same time we are loaning billions and billions of dollars to foreign governments at some 3 or 4 per cent interest, and the eastern bankers and big newspapers and international speculators and many prominent Federal officials are constantly urging its canceling all of those debts. It does seem to me that good will, charity, brotherly love, and especially humane treatment, fair dealing, and justice should begin at home.

Fifth. There must be some—either Federal or State or both—legislation providing cold-storage warehouses and bonded depositories for farm produce. And it seems to me the Federal Government might well undertake that service, especially upon these reclamation projects; and



Sixth. I think great improvement might be made in the system of cooperative marketing.

These are a few of the afflictions that are imposed upon these settlers and that must be corrected; otherwise not only most of the farmers but the merchants there and many other classes of people will be practically ruined. A majority of the farmers will not make enough this year to pay their taxes, while their crops would have been worth several millions of dollars if they could have been promptly and properly marketed. One or two years' extension of payment of construction charges are not at all sufficient. It is not a human possibility for these farmers to recover from the present calamity and be in position to commence paying for the project in less than five years.

This project is a worthy and good one. There is no complaint that it ought not to have been made a Government project, and there is no complaint as to its being impractical; but it is handicapped by a load of unnecessary or at least extravagant and unforeseen expenditures by the Government officials, outrageous and ruinous treatment by the railroad, and many other unforeseen obstacles for which the settlers are not to blame.

The project can be made a great success, and everyone hopes and believes that the present obstacles can be largely overcome and hardships much relieved, but it will be several years; and it will have to be under better and more competent and efficient management than now before that railroad will be in position to give those settlers the necessary transportation service. I think everybody in Colorado hopes that the Burlington or Rock Island or any efficient and capable railroad system may soon take over the Rio Grande and make a railroad of it and run it for the upbuilding of Colorado. It would be a marvelous godsend to about 30 counties of Colorado through which that railroad track runs if there could be a real up-to-date railroad operated on it. But under present conditions it is absolutely unreasonable, it is not even common sense to expect those settlers to commence repaying the Government that \$70 an acre for their water.

There is no use of crimination or recrimination at this time. It is a heartbreaking condition that confronts us. It would not only be cruelly inhuman to force those settlers off of their lands and compel them to lose their homes and the meager savings of a lifetime of hard work for not paying money which they have not got and can not possibly get; it would be not only brutally outrageous but the height of stupidity and idiocy on the part of the Government to put those people off of the lands and put new people or settlers on them. I can not believe that anything of that kind is going to be undertaken or even seriously considered, because the Government holds the land, and it is ample security, and it would be sheer folly to take any course that would even discourage much less drive the farmers off their lands. Even if others could be induced to go on the lands under the existing conditions the new settlers could never make anywhere near as much of a success as the old ones have done. It has been a long, hard struggle. I could say a great deal more. Those settlers deserve much better treatment than being criticized by any Federal officials.

They are not seeking to repudiate one dollar of all that \$7,000,000 expended on the project, although they were promised and had long hoped that it would only be about one-third of that amount. They are not complaining at being the pioneer project and paying dearly for it. They can and will ultimately pay that \$70 an acre. But if Uncle Sam puts impossibly harsh conditions upon them he may discourage them into abandoning their homes. He may return portions of that project largely into a desert, but he can never by any possibility get money out of people who have not got it and can not get it. Their present condition is one in which pressure from the Government will not and can not accomplish any good purpose.

There is no community in the United States that rendered greater services in proportion to its numbers, or subscribed more to Liberty bonds and other relief activities, or did more in any other respect toward upholding the hands of the Government during the war to the utmost of its ability than the people of the Uncompahgre Valley. There is no better or more patriotic class of people in any two of the 3,078 counties of the United States than in Montrose and Delta Counties. And all they ask of our Government is that they be given a fair and reasonable opportunity to raise and market their crops sufficient to sustain themselves and their families and pay off this Government obligation of \$7,000,000. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

#### PRINTING AND BINDING.

For printing and binding for the Department of the Interior, but not including printing and binding for the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, or the Patent Office, \$145,000: *Provided*, That the annual reports of the department and of all its bureaus and establishments, including the Reclamation Service, shall not exceed a total of 1,250 pages.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, lines 21, 22, and 23, strike out the following: "But not including printing and binding for the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, or the Patent Office, \$145,000," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Including all its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere except the Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, and Patent Office, \$145,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is offered to make sure that the language in the paragraph is effective in carrying out the requirements of the provision in the legislative appropriation act for the assembling of all printing and binding items in one place in the bill.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. What is the object of excluding the Patent Office? I notice nowhere in the bill is there an appropriation made for the Patent Office except for the Official Gazette. There are many other publications and pamphlets in the cellar of the Patent Office which are very valuable and are molding and crumbling away.

Mr. CRAMTON. The item we have for printing and binding of the Patent Office is on the next page of the bill.

Mr. WATSON. That is for the Gazette.

Mr. CRAMTON. Also there is an appropriation for the miscellaneous printing and binding, and that has some connection with the situation the gentleman is speaking of.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Protection of game in Alaska: For carrying into effect the act entitled "An act for the protection of game in Alaska, and for other purposes," approved May 11, 1908, including salaries, traveling expenses of game wardens, and all other necessary expenses, \$20,000, to be expended under the direction of the Governor of Alaska.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill how many game wardens there are in Alaska? Alaska is a large country. Also, if the gentleman has a record of the number of the arrests that the game wardens have made, I should be very glad to know it. It would be rather interesting to know. A few game wardens would be of very little use in such a vast territory.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the number is very limited, that is true.

Mr. WATSON. Has the gentleman a record of the number of game wardens?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes; the number of wardens contemplated under the proposed language is nine, with a salary roll of \$13,740. That is a reduction from the current year, and in addition to that there are items of travel expense and telegraph service provided also.

Mr. WATSON. There have been very few arrests; they have had to do very little service?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have not immediately at hand the number of arrests. I might call attention to certain facts at this time, since the item has been mentioned. The people of Alaska through their Territorial legislature have put the license fees for citizens of the United States, nonresidents of Alaska, for hunting at figures that are unreasonably high, and there was an impulse on the part of some of the members of the committee to eliminate this item, feeling that having put the license fees so high as to invite poaching and unauthorized hunting they have put an added burden upon the Federal Treasury, which must be borne by those who are discriminated against. Of course, it immediately appealed to us that perhaps such a policy would be destructive of game in Alaska, so the committee has recommended \$20,000 suggested by the Budget, in the hope that the Territorial Legislature of Alaska will renew the spirit of fairness toward those in the United States who are not residents of Alaska who have not large means who might want to hunt in Alaska.

Mr. WATSON. There is no attempt to place wardens in the northern part of Alaska?

Mr. CRAMTON. I have not that information at hand. The fee amounts to \$150 a year before anyone can do any hunting in Alaska who is a nonresident thereof.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. Chairman, I think we should all bear in mind that the people of Alaska have absolutely no voice in the matter of regulating this matter. Congress placed an inhibition in our organic act which prevents us from having



any voice in the regulation of game. We maintain that inasmuch as Congress passes the laws that govern us, Congress ought to appropriate enough to protect the game to appoint enough game wardens. This year there is a reduction of \$5,000 in the appropriation for game wardens, and there never has been a time in the history of the Territory when game wardens are required as much as they are to-day. We have a great many orientals who come to the Territory every year, going to the canneries, and during the summer season they kill duck and other game out of season, salt it and pack it away and carry it down to San Francisco in the fall. I do not think it is fair that this \$5,000 reduction should be made.

The Clerk read as follows:

For appliances in connection with filing system, \$3,000.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I call attention to the fact that we are now just going to take up these offices of 12 surveyors general, provided for in the bill. I presume that if an inquiry were made of all of us from our constituents, all of us would admit that we are in favor of sane economy, sane retrenchment in governmental expenses. Yet what are we permitting here? I know the pressure that has been brought to bear upon this committee, as it has on other committees that have brought provisions of this kind in the bill. I call attention again to the fact, and remind the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who, every time one mentions retrenchment, comes on the floor, of the facts in connection with these offices. He is the one who, after all, holds the purse strings of the Treasury. Three years ago, after the armistice was signed and we were hoping to get back to normalcy, the Commissioner of the General Land Office appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and testified that, in his judgment, all of these offices of surveyors general ought to be abolished. At that time we had 13, and he testified that they were not needed; that the work could be better done here in Washington; that it was an unnecessary expense; that thousands of dollars could be saved annually, and he recommended to the committee that they abolish the 13 offices. The committee, acting upon his advice, left every one of them out of the bill and brought the bill in as clean as a hound's tooth, so far as these surveyors' offices is concerned. What happened?

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman asks me, the House overruled the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BLANTON. That is just exactly what I want to call attention to. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] felt outraged when I intimated that by reason of being human beings the Committee on Appropriations could be influenced. I did not mean that they could be influenced in a bad way, but, being human beings, they are naturally subject to the same influence as other individuals.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course they are never influenced by votes.

Mr. BLANTON. I will tell him how he is influenced. He imagines right now that nothing on God's earth could influence him against his wish. When we spoke about continuing the civilian bonuses he said that he would not do it; he stood here on the floor and fought every time the matter was proposed, and he said that we had to stop it, that the war was over, that it was a war matter, and that they were going to stop it. Yet how many of these bonuses has he permitted to pass since that time? Six, one for \$120 and five of \$240 each. He has laid down on that proposition because they overreached him upon it.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman knows that we tried to stop it.

Mr. BLANTON. I know; but after all the stream kept wearing on the gentleman until not long ago he said he was not going to fight it any more, that he was going to give another one. Already we have given the civil employees who are entitled to it \$1,320 bonus. I just mention that to show that even our great chairman can be influenced against his will. What happened?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. What happened when our distinguished committee voted to do away with these offices? I want to say that some of the best men in the House were on the committee when it had that matter in charge and when it was left out of the bill. They gave the matter close study; they went into the question. Look at the hearings three years ago, and you will see that they went into the matter to see what ought to be done. It was the consensus of opinion, based on the honest, sincere judgment in behalf of the people, that these 13 surveyors general offices should be left out. They did leave them out of the bill, and what happened? We found our friends from those States that had these offices coming in one by one. You could

look around and call the roll of the 13 of them, and all of them were on the floor, led by the leader of the House, in whose State there was one. They said that we must put them back, right in the face of a claim of retrenchment, and they stood on the floor of this House in committee and put everyone of them back in the bill. Of course, the committee has refrained from leaving it out of the bill since then. I am glad to say in their behalf that they have done away with one of them. We formerly had 13 and they have brought in only 12. Thank God for that. Now I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. As the gentleman knows, it is pretty hard to do away with these things when they are once established.

Mr. BLANTON. I know it.

Mr. CRAMTON. But this committee tries to be practical, not to bring in things that the House is sure to overrule, but to bring in such economies as we can make stick; and so for the current year, in the last Interior Department bill, instead of attacking windmills, we took up the matter practically, and notwithstanding the fact that the House overruled us to a certain extent we saved \$70,000 for the current year on the land offices.

Mr. BLANTON. I commend the gentleman for that.

Mr. CRAMTON. We try to do what can be done.

Mr. BLANTON. I was going to commend the gentleman, but the gentleman's idea is for the Government to be practical in a way that will be approved by 13 men in the House, the men whose particular States enjoy the proceeds of the offices of 13 surveyors general. His idea is that it is going to be opposed and these 13 men are going to be strong enough to put it back; it is hopeless not to put it back. I say if it is right to stop it, stop it. If the commissioner testifies, as he did a few years ago, to the effect that it is useless and ought to stop, the committee ought to stand up here like the Rock of Gibraltar and say to these 13 men in these 13 States where the offices have been, "We are not going to put it back; we like you; we are your friends; we like you personally; but we are not going to do it at the expense of the taxpayers of this country."

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Would the gentleman think it practical to put the surveyors' records 3,000 miles away from the land and from the people who are interested in the surveys? As a private individual, if the gentleman had millions and millions of acres of land thousands of miles away, would he do that thing?

Mr. BLANTON. I answer the gentleman with the testimony of the last commissioner.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; and by that you would build up a great big bureau here, a thing which the gentleman is always fighting.

Mr. BLANTON. In my State there are lands that belong to the State of Texas which are 600 or 700 miles from the land office at Austin.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I am not talking about a thousand miles. I am talking about several thousand miles.

Mr. BLANTON. And yet the business is just as well attended to as if they were located right near Austin. The business of the public, as is said by the Commissioner of the General Land Office—and I did not say it—can be attended to just as well in Washington as out there on the ground. The commissioner says those officers out there are useless.

Mr. COLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. COLTON. We are talking about this matter to-day. Does the present Commissioner of the General Land Office take that attitude?

Mr. FRENCH. He does not.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand he does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, may I have two minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. If the commissioner was given a fair opportunity to express himself I overlooked it.

Mr. FRENCH. On page 93 he expressed himself, and contrary to the advice of the commissioner three years ago.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the commissioner three years ago was a Democratic commissioner, and the one who is there now is a Republican, and that is just the difference between Democratic judgment and Republican judgment.

Mr. FRENCH. It is all in favor of the public.



Mr. BLANTON. It is all in favor of saving the people's money in the Treasury of the United States so that they will not have to pay it out in taxes.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, just a few words in regard to this matter. I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] would not favor the abolition of the offices of surveyors general and the handling of the work in Washington if it would mean adding to the expense rather than subtracting from the expense.

Mr. BLANTON. I would not.

Mr. FRENCH. It is therefore a question of judgment, and, so far as I am aware, the only responsible officer in the Interior Department during many years who has recommended the abolition of the offices of the surveyors general and the handling of the work in Washington was Commissioner Tallman a few years ago. The present commissioner takes another position, and Members of Congress who are closely familiar with this work believe that it would not only be a greater inconvenience to the people and work a more severe hardship, but that it would be less economical to handle the work of the surveys through Washington than through the different agencies throughout the country. The question was directed to the commissioner at the last hearing that we had, and the answer was made directly on this point by the Commissioner of the General Land Office. The question arose following the discussion of the abolition of one office in South Dakota. I read from the hearings:

Mr. BYRNES. Why did you abolish the South Dakota office?

Mr. SPRY. There was no further need of an office there.

Mr. BYRNES. Have you made a survey of the offices to determine whether or not it would be possible to abolish other offices?

Mr. SPRY. Yes, sir; and it is not possible.

Mr. BYRNES. Because of the amount of work being done and the acreage still left in the public-land States?

Mr. FRENCH. Would it be more economical to abolish any of the other offices and handle the work from Washington, or in any other manner than that in which you have handled it under the present system?

Mr. SPRY. I do not think we could duplicate the present system here. I do not think you could bring the work to Washington and handle it as successfully as we are handling it in the various States.

Altogether, then, the testimony, in my judgment, is one-sided on the matter of the convenience of the people and the expedition of the work. There is a debatable question touching the expenditure, and I believe it would probably be equally expensive, if not more expensive, to have all that work done from Washington than to handle it from the different agencies. But I say I do believe in pinching off these different surveyors general's offices just as rapidly as the work can be brought to the point where it can be done.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman any idea whether the action of the House in overriding the judgment and recommendation made by Commissioner Tallman has anything to do with the state of mind of the present commissioner?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, I do not know. I suppose he is meeting the question as a man charged with responsibility would naturally do.

Mr. BLANTON. But the gentleman does know that these little influences do creep in; when the commissioner finds out that the House is in what the late distinguished Speaker Champ Clark used to say "a certain mood," it is absolutely impossible to go up against that mood, and it does influence the state of mind to a certain extent.

Mr. FRENCH. I do not think the present commissioner would be controlled by that fact. I think he was giving us an answer that was direct and sincere and earnest in advising upon a question that might come before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses, \$550; in all, \$14,650.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In order to strike out these various 12 offices of surveyors general would require under our rules a motion after each office was read, or, in fact, after each line was read, as each line contains an item, and each office embraces from three to four lines. I realize, of course, that it would be a waste of time to hope for success in having them stricken out. Therefore, I do not make the motion, but if I thought there was any possibility whatever of the committee sustaining such a motion I would make it.

Mr. CRAMTON. That is very much the position of the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BLANTON. I was sure of it. The only reason I have taken the time to call it to the attention of the committee is in the hope that sooner or later, first in the Committee on Appropriations, or then in this Committee of the Whole, or

then in the House, we will some day stand up here and strike them out, no matter where the chips fall.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to detail temporarily clerks from the office of one surveyor general to another as the necessities of the service may require and to pay their actual necessary traveling expenses in going to and returning from such office out of the appropriation for surveying the public lands. A detailed statement of traveling expenses incurred hereunder shall be made to Congress at the beginning of each regular session thereof.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to inquire of the committee in charge of this bill if they have any figures showing the amount that has been expended for traveling expenses, per diem, and so on, in going back and forth from these different surveyors general's offices and doing the work in the States where there are no surveyors general?

Mr. CRAMTON. There is a very small amount for such States as the gentleman speaks about. Of course, I suppose the gentleman has in mind his own State, where the office was abolished this past year. We have not any apportionment of the expense to cover that particular office.

Mr. WILLIAMSON. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Registers and receivers: For salaries and commissions of registers of district land offices and receivers of public moneys at district land offices, at not exceeding \$3,000 per annum each, \$370,000: *Provided*, That the offices of registers and receivers at the following land offices are hereby consolidated, and the applicable provisions of the act approved October 28, 1921, shall be followed in effecting such consolidations: Leadville, Colo.; Gainesville, Fla.; Guthrie, Okla.; Lakeview, Oreg.; and Waterville, Wash.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee or the gentleman in charge of this item the reasons for the consolidation of the Lakeview office. What is the justification for that?

Mr. FRENCH. In reply I will say that the gentleman will recall that last year the committee found a very undesirable situation confronting the organization of land offices throughout the country. In spite of the law which provides that land offices shall be abolished when the area of public domain within the district that the land office serves shall be not to exceed 100,000 acres, there were numerous land offices where the area was less than a township, others where it was less than half a township.

Again, there is another law which provides that whenever the expenses of a land office exceed 33½ per cent of the income of the office the land office may be abolished. We found a condition existing that had accrued through quite a number of years and several administrations, where land offices were being continued where there was no justification for them. We brought in a rather severe provision last year, as a result of which we wiped out nine land offices entirely and consolidated the offices of register and receiver in something like 26 other land offices; and in spite of the fact that some land offices were restored, we succeeded in effecting a saving of approximately \$71,000 in the handling of this work. The only disastrous result that has occurred of which I am aware was reported to me by one Member from a district that lost one or two land offices. He said that while he was elected to this Congress, he thought he lost 150 or 200 votes on account of our action.

Now, as to the particular land office of Lakeview, let me say that the expenses have increased until they are 40 per cent of the revenues of the office and in excess of the amount suggested in the law as justifying the continuance of the office at all. On the other hand, there is an immense amount of work yet to be done in that district. Your committee thought it was an appropriate time, not to abolish the office but to continue it on a basis that would come within the law and bring its expense down to 33½ per cent or less of its receipts. Therefore we have provided for the consolidation of the offices of register and receiver into one office, and of course have made such allowance as will permit such clerical assistance to be employed as may be necessary. At present there is one clerk employed at that office.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses of land offices: For clerk hire, rent, and other incidental expenses of the district land offices, including the expenses of depositing public money; per diem, in lieu of subsistence, of clerks detailed to examine the books and management of district land offices and to assist in the operation of said offices, and in the opening of new land offices and reservations, when allowed pursuant to section 13



of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and for actual necessary traveling expenses of said clerks: *Provided*, That no expenses chargeable to the Government shall be incurred by registers and receivers in the conduct of local land offices except upon previous specific authorization by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, \$370,000.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 14, line 2, strike out "\$370,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$360,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. In connection with that, Mr. Chairman, I wish to explain that when the officers of the General Land Office were before the committee we noted an estimate of \$36,000 included in this sum for rental of these various land offices, which seemed to be a little increase over the current year. We asked for information to be furnished and a detailed statement of rentals, and when that statement was furnished it developed that the rentals for the current year are \$30,000 instead of \$36,000 as the estimates propose. We thought, therefore, this item could very well be reduced \$6,000 below what had been recommended. But, in addition, the statement of rentals which appears in the hearings shows that in a number of offices the annual rental exceeds \$1,000 per year for each office, and that, too, in small towns or cities and often in offices where there is not much work to do. For instance, at Baton Rouge, La., with a total of 8,816 acres in the State, there is a rental of \$1,440. In Lamar, Colo., the annual rental is \$1,050, with an acreage of 4,324 acres. Of course, we are aware that at such offices as Lamar there are other elements entering into the question, but it impressed the committee that, generally speaking, this rent roll should be pruned somewhat, and so we are suggesting a further cut of \$4,000 in that connection, making a total cut of \$10,000, which we anticipate will come from the rental portion of the estimates.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to call attention to the language in lines 22 and 23 on page 13—  
and for actual necessary traveling expenses of such clerks.

I want to call attention to the fact that the committee have failed to insert the usual restriction of a maximum of \$4 a day for subsistence. In other words, it leaves the actual traveling expenses open to whatever they expend.

Mr. CRAMTON. No; and let me say that this statement will also in part answer the question of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. WILLIAMSON]. The total expenditure estimated for traveling expenses is \$1,000, and the item before us carries this language:

When allowed pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914.

And that contains the \$4 limit.

Mr. BLANTON. That act limits it to \$4?

Mr. CRAMTON. It does.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Depredations on public timber, protecting public lands, and settlement of claims for swamp land and swamp-land indemnity: For protecting timber on the public lands, and for the more efficient execution of the law and rules relating to the cutting thereof; of protecting public lands from illegal and fraudulent entry or appropriation, and of adjusting claims for swamp lands, and indemnity for swamp lands, including not exceeding \$15,000 for clerical services in bringing up and making current the work of the General Land Office, \$485,000, including not exceeding \$35,000 for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for the use of agents and others employed in the field service and for operation, maintenance, and exchange of same and for operation and maintenance of a motor boat: *Provided*, That the compensation of the chief of field service employed hereunder, including his services in the District of Columbia, shall not exceed \$3,500 per annum and the compensation of all others employed hereunder shall not exceed \$2,700 per annum each, except in Alaska, where a compensation not to exceed \$3,000 per annum may be allowed: *Provided further*, That agents and others employed under this appropriation may be allowed per diem in lieu of subsistence, pursuant to section 13 of the sundry civil appropriation act approved August 1, 1914, and actual necessary expenses for transportation, except when agents are employed in Alaska they may be allowed not exceeding \$5 per day each in lieu of subsistence.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 14, line 12, strike out the amount "\$35,000" and insert "\$40,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not increase the appropriation beyond the \$485,000 as carried in the bill, but it makes a larger apportionment available for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for

field service. There is interesting matter in connection with this, which gentlemen will find on page 113 of the hearings, showing the real economy in the operation of Government-owned cars as against rented cars.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alaska whether or not the expense of subsistence—I am not speaking of traveling expenses, but the expense of subsistence—is 20 per cent greater in Alaska than anywhere else in the West?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Yes; I think so. I think that we are absolutely safe in saying it is 20 per cent higher.

Mr. BLANTON. In the Dakotas, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, and various other places in the West we allow \$4 per day for subsistence, but in Alaska we increase it to \$5 a day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. In the gentleman's State you have competition in the sale of merchandise. You have competition in transportation; but in Alaska we have not any competition; we are in the grip of a monopoly, and the charges are two or three times as much to carry merchandise from Seattle to Alaska as they are from New York to Seattle. All these things we have to contend with. The gentleman must recollect also that we are shut off from transportation through Canada, while all the States have that privilege.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the completion of the Government-owned railway, upon which we are expending a great deal of money, give any relief of that situation?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. To the interior of Alaska; it will not on the coast. That takes care of the coast to the interior, but on the coast we are in the hands of the monopoly.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Surveying public lands: For surveys and resurveys of public lands, examination of surveys heretofore made and reported to be defective or fraudulent, inspecting mineral deposits, coal fields, and timber districts, making fragmentary surveys, and such other surveys or examinations as may be required for identification of lands for purposes of evidence in any suit or proceeding in behalf of the United States, under the supervision of the Commissioner of the General Land Office and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, \$650,000: *Provided*, That the sum of not exceeding 10 per cent of the amount hereby appropriated may be expended by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, for the purchase of metal or other equally durable monuments to be used for public land survey corners wherever practicable: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$10,000 of this appropriation may be expended for salaries of employees of the field surveying service temporarily detailed to the General Land Office: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$50,000 of this appropriation may be used for the survey, classification, and sale of the lands and timber of the so-called Oregon & California Railroad lands and the Coos Bay Wagon Road lands.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 3, strike out the amount of "\$53,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, that is simply a reduction in the authorization for survey of the Oregon & California Railroad land.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

##### SALARIES.

Commissioner, \$5,000; assistant commissioner, \$3,500; chief clerk, \$2,750; financial clerk, \$2,250; chiefs of divisions—1 \$2,250; 1 \$2,000; law clerk, \$2,000; assistant chief of division, \$2,000; private secretary, \$1,800; examiner of irrigation accounts, \$1,800; draftsmen—1 \$1,400, 1 \$1,200; clerks—20 of class 4, 31 of class 3, 2 at \$1,500 each, 36 of class 2, 64 of class 1 (including 1 stenographer), 30 at \$1,000 each (including 1 stenographer), 30 at \$900 each, 1 \$720; messenger, \$840; 3 assistant messengers, at \$720 each; 4 messenger boys, at \$420 each; in all, \$306,150.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Page 17, line 20, after the figures "\$306,150," add the following: "*Provided*, That none of the money herein appropriated shall be expended for the preparation of estimates for future appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs which shall not give itemized statement as to the total sum of money requested for expenditure in each reservation, school, or other activity, whether gratuities from the Treasury, withdrawals from Indian funds, treaty items, or otherwise, together with a detailed statement of the total expenditures from all sources and funds for such reservation, school, or other activity during the previous fiscal year."

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it includes not only a limitation



but it directs an executive officer of the Government. In fact, there are a number of directions in it.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the point of order, the amendment I have offered is a limitation on the appropriation of \$306,150.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have offered I believe should be accepted by the subcommittee and also by the Committee of the Whole House without objection because it simply aims to get a businesslike statement of the appropriations carried for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Why are these appropriations carried in a lump sum? Here is an appropriation for irrigation on the reservations of \$197,450. It should be possible to itemize the amount and show on which reservation it is to be spent so that the committee may have the information. There is an appropriation for the support of the Indian schools, \$1,799,500. That is a lump-sum appropriation, almost \$2,000,000, and may be used for many purposes. I believe it is common sense to require information as to which schools and for what ends it is proposed to spend it.

For industrial work, \$375,000 in a lump sum. It is impossible to tell where it is going to be spent, and yet it should be itemized and the reservations should be shown. There has been one difficulty, I will say, in regard to this bill for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and that is that the accounting method does not show in a businesslike way where the money goes. In 1912 a New York accounting firm was put to work and they came back and said that there was no real system in keeping the records in the bureau, and it gave an opportunity for fraud in the handling of these great sums.

In 1919 Mr. Graves, of the Efficiency Bureau of the Government, appeared before the committee and testified that he had tried to install an accounting system in the bureau, but he found a great deal of opposition. He said that there was no one in the Indian Bureau who was interested in whether or not any money was made in any particular activity, or whether there was a loss. Therefore, that part of his proposal had to be eliminated. Here is a chance to put a proviso upon this bill, not cutting down a dollar of appropriation, although it should be cut in two if this proviso is not put in here, because there are too many clerks there, unless they are doing some of the accounting work that this proviso will compel. I believe there should be no objection to this amendment. It is in the interest of efficiency and economy and will mean a great deal eventually for the taxpayers and the Indians.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman's amendment would protect the next appropriation for the fiscal year 1925.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. But for the \$13,000,000 that we are providing in this bill for this bureau we have no accounting whatever.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No business accounting, and I will offer some amendments later to the bill to deal with certain particular items. This amendment will mean that the commissioner when he goes before the committee will have to detail the reservation, the school, and show all of the money appropriated for each particular activity at each location.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. May I ask the gentleman what he means by saying that there is no accounting in respect to the \$13,000,000?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I was quoting from Mr. Graves, who said that there was practically no accounting system.

Mr. CRAMTON. That was in 1912?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. In 1919 his testimony was given before our committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Has the gentleman made any inquiry as to the present situation to find out whether those conditions continued?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, we did before Mr. Graves—

Mr. CRAMTON. Oh, has the gentleman this year made any inquiry as to what the condition is under Commissioner Burke?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. No; it is not necessary, for these immense general items show that the same system continues.

Mr. CRAMTON. Neither is it necessary to make a charge of this kind.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Here is one appropriation of \$1,799,500 without itemizing, and that is sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says that it is not necessary before he gets up on the floor and makes some very serious charges against an official of the Government to find out first whether his charges are true or not. He is giving the House as the only support for his charges a statement by some official at some time in the dim past when the bureau was under a different management, but as to what the situation is under this administration at this time he has no information to give. I hold in my hand a volume containing an itemized statement of the estimates of the Indian Bureau placed in the hands of our committee, and I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] that there is no bureau of the Government that voluntarily comes to the Appropriation Committee and submits its estimates in the detail and in the good order and gives the information that the Bureau of Indian Affairs does. Still the gentleman from Pennsylvania would have this House understand that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has a great lump sum of \$11,000,000 to disburse for which it makes no accounting whatever—

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Oh, I did not say that.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not yield to the gentleman—as to which it gives no information. But the gentleman brings in some amendment here of his own concoction, without any previous notice to the committee in charge of the bill, with no opportunity to examine the provisions of the amendment that he has offered to determine whether or not it is wise, with nothing except that we know that they come from the gentleman from Pennsylvania; and I submit that this committee can not afford to impose unknown burdens, possibly making necessary hordes of clerks to seek out information which the House does not know whether it wants or not.

The gentleman speaks about the item for irrigation on page 59, a preliminary paragraph. Then they go down district by district, and every single dollar is itemized, we are told how it will be spent, and when we come to the schools the gentleman will find in the printed hearings, what was in all of these estimates, that the individual salary of every individual employee connected with every school, in so far as the whole five or six million dollars is concerned, is set forth in black and white. I guarantee the gentleman from Pennsylvania has not yet read a quarter of the information that is now available for him, and he would not read what is called for in his amendment if it was compiled for him at great expense to the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] has committed a hanging offense. It is true that he is not now a member of this subcommittee of five members, and they may have had information probably before them that he has not had; and if they have had the information before them that he seeks to bring before the next committee, still his amendment is not such a terrible crime. After all, his purposes are good, and I am with him. He has been on this Indian Committee. He has served faithfully. No one will contend that the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not work as hard as any other member of the committee when he was a member of it. He knows something about the Indian business.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. He does not know as much as our friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER]. No one could do that, because Mr. CARTER knows all about the business, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania probably knows as much as any other Member of the House, I take it, about the subject of Indian affairs. If his amendment will absolutely insure for the committee in the next fiscal year the getting of information which the chairman says that he has already gotten, then his amendment has not gone far wrong. It is a good amendment, after all. It could only be called surplusage. I do not see any occasion for this cyclone that has been raised, which is about to sweep the whole House of Representatives off its feet and annihilate all action except that which comes from the committee itself. It is true that out of 435 Members only a few of us have come here to-day to attend to the Nation's business, and we ought to be permitted to attend to it. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is only seeking to attend to the people's business, and I commend him for it.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Would it not be a good plan to have under the reservation head all the expenses from all these lump sums?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. And in view of the fact that the committee is furnished with a detailed report, the only additional expenditure would be the printing of the report, would it not?



Mr. BLANTON. That is true; but this is not going to require any additional expense. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, and no one has denied it, that the expert accountants from New York that came down here in 1912 said the business of that department was in a terrible shape; that there was no system whatever of proper accounting there. He said to us frankly that that condition existed in 1917, when the Bureau of Efficiency here saw fit to investigate the facts and make its recommendation. He brought it in, not in a partisan way. He referred to it under a Republican administration first and then under a Democratic administration and now again under a Republican administration. It was the same under both administrations. It was not partisan. He was merely seeking to rectify the situation; and we are not sure, without the gentleman's amendment—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, may I have one minute more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is aware, I assume, that the Budget Bureau is outlining methods of bookkeeping and accounting to govern all the agencies of the Government?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I am with the Bureau of the Budget. I am backing them up here every day when I vote, and I vote to hold their maximum as our outside limit, and I also vote to hold the committee's maximum as our outside limit. But because we have a Budget, and because we have our distinguished friends on this committee, there is no reason why the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as a Member of this House, should not get up here and make a proper suggestion. I am going to vote for his amendment, because it is a good one.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I remember when the criticism was made by the accountant who was working here establishing new systems in all the Government departments. He did criticize the accounting system in the Department of the Interior, just as he criticized the accounting systems in other departments of the Government. He did not charge that large sums were spent without being accounted for; he simply criticized the manner in which the accounting was done. Since then the system that he suggested has been adopted and is being carried out.

I find here, in the first item that I opened up, an analysis of an expenditure by the Bureau of Indian Affairs which is typical of every item appropriated for in this bill and every item that has been appropriated for in years that have passed and that will be carried in the future, I have no doubt. I happened to open up at the item, "Suppressing the liquor traffic among Indians." For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, the amount appropriated was \$30,000; fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, amounted appropriated, \$35,000; amount expended, \$27,384.03; unexpended balance, \$7,615.97. Under "Analysis of expenditure": Salaries, wages, and so forth, \$11,905.80; traveling expenses, \$14,041.32; transportation of supplies, \$8,063; stationery and printing, \$155.17; equipment and miscellaneous material, \$1,093.11; miscellaneous, \$180.

Then follow several pages of detailed itemizations of these expenditures, showing how it was done.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Itemized on reservations and the other expenditures, so that we can get at each expenditure at each reservation?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. There is a total for each reservation?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes. He will find a minute analysis of all these expenditures if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will go into the record to ascertain what the facts are.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have read that; but there is nothing there to show where the money is expended. There should be no objection to my amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The gentleman's proposition would merely add vastly to the expense of conducting the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. How could it do that when it asks that an itemized statement be presented to the committee?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Such statements are presented.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Then why should the gentleman object to my amendment?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They are here.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. There is no objection, then, on the part of the gentleman to the amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to see the interest taken in these matters by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] and by my friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON]. I do not quite agree with them, but I am glad to find such men giving attention to these important matters, and out of such discussions as these perhaps will come some good, wholesome legislation eventually.

I had the good fortune to serve on the committee with the gentleman from Pennsylvania for several years, and I found him to be a very active, energetic, and efficient member of the committee, taking an interest at all times for the Government and for the Indians. The gentleman now proposes an amendment, however, that in my judgment ought not to be adopted. It ought not to be adopted because it will preclude the use of any of these funds for the beneficial purposes set out until estimates are made at the next session of Congress for the appropriations. The estimates can not be made before next autumn. It means a suspension of Indian schools.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. CARTER. In a moment. It means a suspension of all irrigation development. It means a suspension of all agency activities and the protection of the Indians generally. I do not think the gentleman realizes the far-reaching effect of the amendment he has proposed.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. This amendment refers only to the Secretary's office.

Mr. CARTER. Well, none of the agencies can function without the head of the bureau functioning. It will be necessary to have a Commissioner of Indian Affairs, an Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and a superintendent of education, and all the other bureaus functioning. Otherwise there would be no head to direct the subordinates.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a minute?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Let me put in the Record a letter I wrote last year, 1921, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, asking for a very brief and simple statement of the amounts of money appropriated for the last 20 years from tribal funds and for gratuities. I remember I got back a statement that they did not have that information.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman certainly would not call a statement regarding all those activities for 20 years a simple statement. It would certainly be a very complicated statement, involving a large amount of work, digging through old documents and papers not now in use, and requiring, perhaps, a search of half a day sometimes to dig out one amount that the gentleman requested.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, as to the item just read, for four messenger boys, the gentleman wants a statement of what part of the compensation of those four messenger boys down there in the office is to be charged for the Seminole Indians in Florida, and what part for the Quillehute Indians in Washington, and the Ontonagon Indians in Michigan. Eventually, after the figures are made out, they would not be worth anything, anyhow.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is facetious in his statement as to the effect of my amendment. My amendment refers specifically to the money spent on the reservation.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was unfortunate in his request calling for definite estimates when he referred to the irrigation item.

Every one of them is set out separately in this bill just preceding the amount the gentleman referred to, the amount of \$197,450. For instance, after the first part of the clause we have—

Irrigation district 1: Round Valley Reservation, Calif., \$1,000; Hoopa Valley, Calif., \$1,500; Colville Reservation, Wash., \$6,000; total, \$8,500.

Irrigation district 2: Walker River Reservation, Nev., \$5,000; Western Shoshone Reservation, Idaho and Nevada, \$2,000; Shivwits, Utah, \$500; total, \$7,500.

Irrigation district 3: Tongue River, Mont., \$1,500.

Irrigation district 4: Ak Chin Reservation, Ariz., \$3,400; Chiu Chiu pumping plants, Arizona, \$12,600; Coachella Valley pumping plants, California, \$4,000; Morongo Reservation, Calif., \$7,000; Pala Reservation and Rincon Reservation, Calif., \$4,500; Owens Valley, Calif., \$2,000; Tuolumne Reservation, Calif., \$2,700; miscellaneous projects, \$10,000; total, \$46,200.

Irrigation district 5: New Mexico Pueblos, \$15,000; Zuni Reservation, N. Mex., \$7,500; Navajo and Hopi miscellaneous projects, Arizona, including Tes-nos-pos, Moencop Wash, Kin-le-chee, Wide Ruins, Red Lake, Corn Creek, Wepo Wash, Oraibi Wash, and Polacca Wash, \$20,000; Southern Ute Reservation, Colo., \$20,000; total, \$62,500.

And so on, until each item is set out in detail, and the bill states specifically just where the money is to be used and how much is to be used on each reservation. So there is not an irri-



gation appropriation in any bill that is set out more definitely than this general irrigation proposition in this Indian bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. I ask one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent for one minute more. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. As the gentleman will remember, some five or six years ago, at the earnest solicitation of the committee, the House rearranged this item so that every amount is specifically itemized. They are carried so plainly that he who runs may read. It would not be possible for any irrigation item to be stated more in detail than this particular one; and if the same plan were followed as to schools and all other items, instead of this bill being slightly more than 100 pages in length it would be 600 or 700 pages, and might take half the session of Congress to pass it.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it seems that the committee is just one jump ahead of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]. In their endeavor to get a comprehensive report of the Indian Commissioner's affairs, at the request of some one on this committee the Bureau of Indian Affairs has prepared a most elaborate explanation of the expenditure of every dollar expended for the Indian, by the Indian, or by his friends, and that statement has been presented to this committee for their guidance in the framing of this measure. With the little experience I have had, I could not help commending the Commissioner of Indian Affairs for furnishing this complete statement which he has furnished. I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] if he has seen this book setting out all these expenditures?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. In reply I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not in that Book of Estimates there is a complete statement of every dollar appropriated for the Blackfeet Reservation in Montana?

Mr. MURPHY. I think so.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. For schools, irrigation, and other expenses? If so, I would like to see it.

Mr. MURPHY. Every dollar asked for by the Bureau of Indian Affairs is itemized, dollar for dollar, and there is a statement of the project where it is to be expended, why it is to be expended, and all about it.

I dare say that if the gentleman from Pennsylvania had had access to this information he would not have presented this matter at this time, because there is no question that the Committee on Appropriations is doing the very best that can be done for the protection of every dollar raised by taxation and every dollar to be expended from the Indian fund; and of all those who came before this subcommittee presenting their various projects the bureau having charge of Indian affairs presented the most comprehensive explanation of everything they asked for of everyone who appeared before the committee. I think the gentleman's amendment is unnecessary, because it will involve additional expense; for, as I have said, we are just one jump ahead of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because we already have what he is asking for.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. There is a vital difference between the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER]. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] says it would involve great additional expense. The gentleman from Ohio says it is already being done. Therefore there is a difference of opinion even among the committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman's question in regard to the Blackfeet Reservation will illustrate the difference. The gentleman wants forthwith and immediately to know just how much is expended this year for the Blackfeet. Now, through the bill there are several items that make appropriations definitely, clearly, and particularly for the Blackfeet Reservation. There may be something for irrigation, something for support and civilization, there is something more in the hospital item, and the committee can not assemble all these items in a moment and turn over the total to the gentleman, but the hearings will disclose all these different items.

In addition, there is something that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] has in mind and that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] has in mind when they talk about additional expense. The hearings disclose that information, which is essential, necessary, and practical, so the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] states. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] urges that the amendment proposed would go further and include the unnecessary and impracticable.

For instance, here is a little item that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] spoke about—\$15,000 for the suppression of the liquor traffic among the Indians. Some of that \$15,000 may be spent, perhaps, among the Blackfeet and some of it elsewhere. There are a number of tribes scattered all over the United States, and we appropriate a little item of \$15,000 to carry out one purpose, and we trust the discretion of the bureau to spend that \$15,000 to the best advantage. Now, if you require them in advance to say that they are going to spend \$40 among the Seminoles of Florida, and \$100 among the Blackfeet, and \$200 among the Chickasaws, and then an emergency develops in the course of the year, and later when the money is to be spent it develops that there is need for \$100 in Florida and \$50 among the Blackfeet, the gentleman has required them to sew themselves up in advance, and in order to do that useless thing we will have to spend a lot of money unnecessarily.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I trust the gentleman will understand that I simply want the total on the reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for irrigation on Indian reservations, \$197,450, reimbursable as provided in the act of August 1, 1914 (38 Stat. at L. p. 582): *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended on any irrigation system or reclamation project for which public funds are or may be otherwise available: *Provided further*, That the foregoing amounts appropriated for such purposes shall be available interchangeably in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior for the necessary expenditures for damages by floods and other unforeseen exigencies: *Provided, however*, That the amount so interchanged shall not exceed in the aggregate 10 per cent of all the amounts so appropriated.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Page 20, line 24, after the word "reservation," strike out the figures "\$197,450" and all of line 25 and line 1 on page 21 to the semicolon, and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$135,000."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the general items carrying \$197,450 for which there is a justification in the regular form that has been used for many years on behalf of the Indian Bureau. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, there was appropriated \$174,500, but of that appropriation only \$132,220 was spent. I provide for an appropriation of \$135,000, which is a sum in excess of the amount expended for 1922. The analysis of the expenditure shows the salaries and wage account was \$85,297 and the traveling expenses \$10,000, making \$95,000 for expenses of that kind. The equipment and miscellaneous and material items ought to give some indication of the material cost, which is \$15,550, and shows a great disproportion compared to salaries. Now, as to this reimbursable proposition, it is one which should be discontinued entirely or put on a sound basis. Some years ago we started in on the reimbursable plan for the first time. We advanced the money for irrigation purposes, putting liens on the land of the Indians. We have appropriated \$28,283,495 of the American taxpayers' money and very few millions have come back, either for industrial purposes or irrigation. The additional amount needed to complete all items would be \$32,350,700, so that we are involved in the tremendous proposition with \$32,000,000 yet to go.

The act of 1914 provided that first liens should be laid on the lands to pay for the cost, but it stated that it should not be enforced as long as the land was occupied by the original possessor of the lands or his heirs. What is the effect of that? That means the perpetuation of tribalism. You are going to bind the Indian to the reservation so that he can not get away. His land is mortgaged, and if he disposes of it this lien by the Government is enforced. I believe that the time has come when we should have a constructive plan for reimbursement if we are to continue it at all. The time will come when we will have to cancel fifteen or twenty million dollars. We will have to wipe that off altogether. Why should we not start now and lay down an efficient business system? My amendment provides \$135,000—more than was used during 1922. Then we should put the reimbursable proposition on a sound basis through the action of the Indian Affairs Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.



The Clerk read as follows:

SUPPORT OF INDIAN SCHOOLS.

For support of Indian day and industrial schools not otherwise provided for, and other educational and industrial purposes in connection therewith, \$1,799,500: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$40,000 of this amount may be used for the support and education of deaf and dumb or blind or mentally deficient Indian children: *Provided*, That all reservation and nonreservation boarding schools, with an average attendance of less than 45 and 80 pupils, respectively, shall be discontinued on or before the beginning of the fiscal year 1924: *Provided*, That this limitation as to attendance shall not apply to the Hope Indian School for Girls at Springfield, S. Dak., which school is hereby continued. The pupils in schools so discontinued shall be transferred first, if possible, to Indian day schools or State public schools; second, to adjacent reservation or nonreservation boarding schools, to the limit of the capacity of said schools: *Provided further*, That all day schools with an average attendance of less than eight shall be discontinued on or before the beginning of the fiscal year 1924: *And provided further*, That all moneys appropriated for any school discontinued pursuant to this act or for other cause shall be returned immediately to the Treasury of the United States: *Provided further*, That not more than \$250,000 of the amount herein appropriated may be expended for the tuition of Indian children enrolled in the public schools: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the support of Indian day and industrial schools where specific appropriation is made: *Provided, however*, That the deficiency appropriation of \$290,000 made by the act approved March 1, 1921, for the support of Indian day, boarding, and industrial schools is hereby declared to be available for expenditure for the benefit of all such Indian schools whether supported by specific appropriations or otherwise.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to that part of the paragraph beginning on line 25, page 22, to the end of the paragraph. I make the point of order that it is new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's point of order?

Mr. RAKER. I think there is too much new legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. To what part of the paragraph does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. RAKER. Commencing in line 25, the word "provided," on page 22, and running down to and including line 5, on page 24. I want to include all the provisos.

The CHAIRMAN. Down to the Indian schools and the agency, on the next page.

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from Michigan say to the point of order made by the gentleman from California?

Mr. CRAMTON. If I understand, the gentleman's point of order begins at the bottom of page 23, the last line, and ends at the end of the paragraph on page 24. I think I understand what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. RAKER. No; I make the point of order against all the provisos, beginning on page 22, line 25, down to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. CRAMTON. But they are all sustained and within the authority of the committee to report. The first one is that \$40,000 of this amount may be used for the support and education of the deaf, dumb, and blind or mentally deficient children of the Indians. This authority is given by the Snyder Act for the general support and civilization, including education. The Snyder Act reads as follows:

That the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, shall direct, supervise, and expend such moneys as Congress may from time to time appropriate, for the benefit, care, and assistance of the Indians throughout the United States for the following purposes:

General support and civilization, including education.  
For relief of distress and conservation of health.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. What I am trying to get at is this: The whole amount, \$1,799,500, may be used by the department as it thinks best and should not be controlled by legislation of the committee. That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. CRAMTON. As I understand now, Mr. Chairman, the point of order made by the gentleman from California—and if I do not state it accurately I will be glad to have him correct me—is that the whole amount, \$1,799,500, is in order for the general purpose stated, but that it is legislation for the committee to put in a limitation as to the amount to be expended for any one purpose within the general purpose which, of course, I think requires no argument. It is not legislation.

I think I have stated the gentleman's position correctly. As to the first item, for instance, we could have appropriated \$5,000,000 for the support and education of deaf and dumb or blind Indian children, but we have simply put in a limitation that not over \$40,000 of that shall be used for that purpose. That is not legislation. I understand that is typical of the point which the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] makes.

Mr. HICKS. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Michigan could defend his position against the point of

order on the second proviso, that that is a saving to the Treasury of the United States and in order under the Holman rule.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is a saving.

Mr. CARTER. It is not a change of existing law. The Secretary has the right to discontinue schools whenever in his discretion it should be done.

Mr. HICKS. It is a saving, and is in order under the Holman rule.

Mr. CARTER. It would be, certainly, but the Secretary has that right. This is simply a requirement made on the Secretary under existing law.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman suggested that it would be a saving. You can make that general statement without any real facts on which to base it. The gentleman says that they will discontinue the schools unless they have a certain number of pupils. At the bottom of the same proviso provision is made to transfer these pupils to other schools, and the gentleman will know, if he has investigated that, that it is costing the Government more money to make these transfers where they discontinue the schools when you take care of the same number of pupils.

Mr. CARTER. Let me call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the proviso referred to by the gentleman from California pertains to boarding schools, and here the proviso pertains to the public schools. Certainly it will be cheaper to educate the children in the public schools than in a boarding school.

Mr. RAKER. The suggestion I made is that where they discontinued the nonreservation or reservation schools they must and do transfer them to some other nonreservation or boarding school. Sometimes they send them as high as a thousand or two thousand miles away from where the children have their homes, at a large expense, and in the ultimate, the Government is paying out more money to educate these Indian pupils by scattering them broadcast, and that is within my own personal knowledge and observation, through visiting the schools and observing what is being done with these Indians in California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman's statement regarding the matter in so far as nearly all of these different provisos is concerned, is, the Chair thinks, correct, but the Chair would call attention to the second proviso, and the third and the fourth, which seem to be connected together and to be of similar nature. For instance, taking the first proviso—

That all reservation and nonreservation boarding schools, with an average attendance of less than 45 and 80 pupils, respectively, shall be discontinued on or before the beginning of the fiscal year 1924.

What does the gentleman say as to whether that is legislation?

Mr. CRAMTON. The Snyder Act of November 2, 1921, carried the blanket authority in the form of legislation to the Bureau of Indian Affairs to direct, supervise and expend such moneys as Congress may from time to time appropriate for the benefit, care, and assistance of the Indians throughout the United States "for the following purposes":

For general support and civilization of the Indian, and for education.

So that that money that Congress does appropriate for education of Indians may be administered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations is to report to this House sums of money to be appropriated for the specific purposes within the general purpose of education. Having done so, that committee has the authority to say that we appropriate for 1 school or 10 schools or 100 schools, and in the course of such an appropriation may define the use of the appropriation. That is entirely within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. The legislative authority has already been given in the Snyder Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the fundamental law, the law under which this appropriation is made, would it not be interpreted that the Secretary is given discretion as to whether or not he will discontinue the schools?

Mr. CRAMTON. Discretion no doubt except for such a paragraph as is before us.

The CHAIRMAN. If that be true, if this proviso takes away from the Secretary any discretion, would it be a change of existing law?

Mr. CRAMTON. No; the Snyder Act does not explicitly give any authority to the Bureau of Indian Affairs to do anything except to use such money as Congress may from time to time appropriate. It does not give the bureau authority to continue those schools in existence at the time the Snyder Act became law. It gives the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, authority to administer the money that Congress gives in its appropriations, but when Congress makes an appropriation for a specific purpose the Bureau



of Indian Affairs can only use it for the purpose for which it is appropriated, and hence this committee may at any time report to Congress an appropriation of \$100,000 for a school that has not been heretofore in existence, or we may cut out, with no appropriation, the school, say, at Albuquerque, and hence the bureau can not spend the money for that school since none has been appropriated; and, having that authority, your committee in this general paragraph may restrict the use for the money thereby given, directing to him where to use the money that is given.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, if I may add a word in support of the proposition offered by the committee and against the point of order made by the gentleman from California, I would respectfully call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the reduction in schools must be a saving of public funds.

Mr. CARTER. And it is a limitation.

Mr. HICKS. Yes; and the gentleman speaks of the matter of transportation. It seems to me it would be cheaper to educate the children in one general school than in a thousand schools scattered all over the country. For that reason it seems to me that this is a saving of public money, and it comes under the provisions of the Holman rule.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. That would be true if the language here would carry out what the gentleman has suggested, but this language directs what the Secretary shall do. It is legislation.

Mr. HICKS. But for the purpose of saving money.

Mr. DOWELL. It is not only limitation but it is a direction that he shall do certain things.

Mr. HICKS. It would save the public funds.

Mr. DOWELL. It has no relation whatever to this appropriation. It may not save money and it may. That is purely a speculation, but the question arises that this is permanent. If you direct him to do certain things, that is permanent law and it has nothing to do with a limitation on this appropriation.

Mr. HICKS. I can not concede that at all.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HICKS. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman speaks of its being legislation. The gentleman does not question that this committee could have brought in an appropriation bill specifying how much money, item by item, should be expended as to all of these schools, does he?

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman can do this: He can limit this appropriation to any amount that he sees fit.

Mr. CRAMTON. And can itemize—

Mr. DOWELL. And can take all of it away, which will close the schools—

Mr. CRAMTON. And itemize by schools where it can be used, and the next year provide an entirely different itemization?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes; but you can not direct the Secretary as to a matter of legislation which does not affect this appropriation.

Mr. CARTER. If that is true, then no limitation would be in order upon an appropriation bill, because every limitation would prevent somebody from using certain funds. What does it say? It says that none of these reservation schools having less than 45 and 80 pupils, respectively, shall be operated during that fiscal year, to wit, none of these funds shall be used for that purpose during that fiscal year, the fiscal year of 1924, the very year that this bill deals with.

Now, what does that language mean? It means that no money shall be spent for these schools during the year 1924. You could not make it any plainer even by adding "Provided, That no funds shall be used for these schools for the year 1924." It is certainly a limitation which the House has the right to put upon the Secretary if it thinks necessary. Otherwise we shall never be able to effect any economy by our legislation here.

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman does not need to appropriate from this committee. This is not an appropriation. This is a direction.

Mr. CARTER. The appropriation here in the first part of the item is \$1,799,500, to be used how? To be used according to specifications to be laid out in the bill later, and one of which is that none of these reservation schools having less than 45 and 80 pupils, respectively, shall be operated during that fiscal year, to wit, that none of these funds shall be used for that purpose during that fiscal year. There is no doubt, Mr. Chairman, about the Secretary having the right to suspend any school he wants to at any time.

Mr. DOWELL. Then why does the gentleman direct him to do a thing that you say he has authority to do without the direction?

Mr. CARTER. Just for the reason that if we were to find that he was spending money wrongfully, say, in pensions or in irrigation or in anything; if we thought an irrigation project, for instance, should be stopped, we could say, "Provided, That no money shall be expended on that particular project for the year 1924." That is what we do in this item respecting schools.

Mr. DOWELL. You say he has already authority to do this, and if that is so, it is not necessary.

Mr. CARTER. We are limiting it to the extent that we keep the appropriation out entirely and do not allow him to use any funds for it.

Mr. DOWELL. No; you are not cutting out the appropriation; you are directing him to do certain things that have no relation with this appropriation.

Mr. CARTER. We say just as plainly as we can that these schools shall be suspended. There can not be an appropriation for them if they are suspended. That is as clearly a limitation as the English language could make it.

Mr. HICKS. In other words, if that proviso were not in there, there would have to be some money in there?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; to take care of those schools. I remember the distinguished former Speaker of this House, Champ Clark, in deciding a point of order, said if you wanted to you could provide that a certain amount of money shall not be paid to a red-headed school-teacher.

Mr. DOWELL. There is no question about that proposition, but that is not the proposition we have here.

Mr. CARTER. That is the fact. The gentleman has not analyzed the entire item. If he would analyze the entire item he would see that this does only one thing, to wit, it does not permit any expenditure for these schools during the year 1924.

Mr. DOWELL. No; the gentleman is not limiting this appropriation. If he were doing that only, that would be in order without a direction. But you are directing the Secretary to do certain things which have nothing to do with this appropriation.

Mr. CARTER. What are we trying to do? To suspend certain schools. If you suspend certain schools, it means there will be no money used on those schools, and there is no appropriation for them.

Mr. HICKS. And we are saving money?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The question raised by this point of order is not altogether clear. The language of the act of Congress approved November 2, 1921, was very broad and general in its character. The act provides:

That the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, shall direct, supervise, and expend such moneys as Congress may from time to time appropriate for the benefit, care, and subsistence of the Indians throughout the United States, for the following purposes: General support and civilization, including education.

Now, then, an appropriation is here provided of a certain amount of money, the language being "for support of Indian day and industrial schools not otherwise provided for," and the language which follows is very general, as the committee will see: "Other educational and industrial purposes in connection therewith." In other words, the language of the provision of this appropriation bill is intended to be, and is, in accordance with the general law.

Now, various provisions are inserted following that general appropriation and following that general statement of the purpose, among others the following:

That all reservation and nonreservation boarding schools with an average attendance of less than 45 and 80 pupils, respectively, shall be discontinued on or before the beginning of the fiscal year 1925.

It might appear very well, if we do not go rather deeply into the proposition, that that would constitute a change in the existing law, because of the fact that whereas the general law gave to the Secretary the discretion with regard to disbursements of funds in this way, this provision might seem to limit that general discretion. However, I am inclined to think that it would be not within the stated purpose of the general law to give that sort of an interpretation to this provision and the others which follow; and I do that upon this broad and general ground: The statement here is that "the Bureau of Indian Affairs, under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, shall direct, supervise, and expend such moneys as Congress may from time to time appropriate for the benefit, care, and assistance of the Indians throughout the United States for the following purposes: General support, including education." Now, here we have a proviso which says that this appropriation shall not be used for a particular class of schools during the year for which this appropriation is to be used. The Chair thinks that would clearly, generally speaking, be within the power of the Congress, and certainly within the scope of the provision of the



general act which is made for this particular purpose. That being the case, the Chair feels that he is justified in overruling the point of order. The Clerk will read.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: On page 22, line 25, after the figures "\$1,799,500," add the following:

"Provided further, That no part of the amount herein appropriated shall be expended for any purpose not directly connected with the education of Indian children."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent first to modify the amendment by striking out the word "further," which is unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the proposed amendment will be so modified.

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Now, Mr. Chairman, this brings up the question which my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] and I had up a few minutes ago regarding the possibility of expending money out of this "Support of Indian schools" item for other purposes than those directly connected with Indian schools.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman said "farmers," did he not?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I said "farmers."

Mr. CARTER. Does the gentleman consider that the farmers and stockmen who teach the Indians to farm and raise stock are not directly connected with their education?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman made a different statement—

Mr. CARTER. I am not making any statement. I am asking the gentleman a question.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman from Oklahoma is right, then, of course, there should be no hesitation about the adoption of this amendment, which provides that no part of this appropriation shall be spent for any purpose other than that directly connected with the schools. I say it is possible under this appropriation to pay out the money for farmers, stockmen, matrons, relieving distress, and other purposes which are already provided for in special items.

Now, let me prove exactly what I am saying by quoting from pages 350 and 351 of the special investigation of the Indian Bureau held by the Indian Affairs Committee of the Sixty-sixth Congress. I was a member of the committee then and had a somewhat active part in that inquiry.

Here is the statement of Mr. Meritt, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs:

Mr. MERITT. From an administrative standpoint we think that there are too many items in the Indian bill. Practically every administrative official that I have met in Washington believes that appropriations for his bureau or department should be in as near lump-sum form as possible, so that he can administer those funds to meet the needs as they may arise. We realize that Congress has an objection to that form of making appropriations. The Indian bill is a matter of growth covering a long period of years, and we are required under the law to follow the form of the bill of the previous year. I think it could be very materially improved upon, and at the same time Congress could keep track of the moneys appropriated. The bill is somewhat misleading to a Member who has not had long experience on the Indian Committee. For example, we will have an appropriation for the support and civilization of the Klamath Reservation in Oregon, including pay of employees, \$6,000. That would imply to an uninformed Member of Congress that that was all the money that we used for administrative purposes on that reservation, when in fact we use a very much larger amount than is stated in the bill. We not only use that fund but we take money out of the general funds in the bill for various activities.

Mr. CARTER. Now, Mr. Meritt, let me ask you, can you use funds from a general fund for a purpose for which a specific appropriation is made under the law?

Mr. MERITT. Where there is a specific appropriation for a specific purpose we are not permitted to supplement that appropriation by any other fund. For example, where we have an appropriation for a non-reservation school we would not be permitted to use any of the general appropriation for school support to supplement the specific appropriation for a nonreservation school. \* \* \*

Mr. CARTER. Now, Mr. Meritt, what do you use that \$6,000 for; for the Klamaths?

Mr. MERITT. We use it for administrative purposes on the Klamath Reservation.

Mr. CARTER. Can you take here from the general administrative appropriation any funds to use for administrative purposes there?

Mr. MERITT. We could take from the Indian school support.

Mr. CARTER. But that is not answering the question. My question was: Could you take it from the general administration item in the bill?

Mr. SNYDER. That support of the Indian schools is a general administrative item.

Mr. MERITT. We have no fund that is known as the general administrative item. These items are particularized for school support. For example, we could use a part of the lump-sum appropriation for school support in maintaining schools on that reservation; we could use part of the appropriation for relieving distress, for maintaining physicians on that reservation. We could use part of the appropriation for the farmers in paying the salary of a farmer on that reservation.

Mr. CARTER. But you could not do it if you had a specific appropriation for any of those purposes, could you?

Mr. MERITT. No, sir.

Mr. ELSTON. That is exactly what I wanted to find out. By reason of the elasticity of some of these general appropriations would you say that the bureau has authority to institute new activities and create new functions and corresponding new positions without authorization of Congress?

Mr. MERITT. We can create new positions on Indian reservations without authority from Congress, but we must keep within the appropriations authorized by Congress in the total expenditure of funds.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SNYDER). Isn't that one of the invisible reasons for this 6,000 employees here who have gradually grown on the roll without Congress being advised that they were being worked into the service?

Mr. MERITT. The growth of the service has been gradual and the appropriations for the service have gradually increased, and as the activities of the service in the field increase the bureau would come to Congress and ask for increased appropriations. For example, in the Sioux country, before the allotments were made, there was not very much activity on those reservations, but since the allotments have been made and the property prorated among the Indians there has been necessarily a very greatly increased amount of work, and we have accordingly been required to ask for a larger appropriation.

I made the statement, Mr. Chairman, that it was possible to take out of this lump sum for the support of schools money for other purposes, and Mr. Meritt, who is in charge of the bill before the committee on behalf of the bureau, corroborates my statement.

Mr. CARTER. From what report is the gentleman reading?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The Indian investigation of the Sixty-sixth Congress, when the committee reviewed the appropriation bill for 1920, page 351.

Mr. CARTER. The report or the hearings?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The hearings before the committee.

Mr. CARTER. I still maintain, Mr. Chairman, that if Mr. Meritt made any such statement as that he was mistaken, just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania is.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I will yield, yes; although the gentleman would not yield to me a moment ago.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman started the precedent, and I will not take the gentleman's time now if he objects.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. I want to ask the gentleman if he has before him the language of the appropriation bill to which that statement of Mr. Meritt purports to refer.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes; it was section 20 of the bill for 1920, for the support and civilization of the Klamath Agency, Oreg., including pay for employees, \$6,000. On that item the whole question came up, and Mr. Meritt said that, instead of being used for schools, the money could be used for these other purposes. Now, we desire to have this money spent for schools—and I do desire it, for I believe the right kind of school is the civilizing agency for the Indian. I should like to see this money, which is \$124,000 more than we appropriated last year, spent for the Indian children, to give them an education, so that they may become a part of the American community and not have the bureau take out of this lump-sum appropriation money to be used for the relief of distress when they have a large appropriation for the relief of distress. I do not want to see the money used for the payment of stockmen and farmers when there is already a large appropriation for the payment of stockmen and farmers.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman let me see that hearing?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have it copied here. I will get the printed copy of the hearing.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I should like two minutes more.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania is quite well aware that every item appropriated for in this bill has been calculated, and the number of students attending each school is itemized, and every dollar has been accounted for as the representatives of the Indian Bureau came before this committee and asked for it. Every item in this particular part of this bill is protected by that sort of information which is in this book that we referred to. Every item has been specified and every expenditure has been itemized as it came before the committee, and it has been pared down. Where there was a possibility of fluctuation in the numbers of those attending the schools from day to day we took the benefit of the doubt, and



we cut them down. So I do not believe the gentleman could find the possibility of diverting these funds into some other channel.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman has the Book of Estimates, which is the all-powerful word in this matter, let me ask him to tell me what has been done with the money appropriated last year under Indian school support?

Mr. MURPHY. I was not on the committee last year. I am a new man on the committee, but my observation so far is that this Indian Bureau have brought the figures in and put their cards on the table face up. I want to say to gentlemen on the floor that if every department of the Government was as honestly administered as is the Indian Bureau we would see the Government's tax money well expended.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I am making no objection to the honesty of the bureau for years. I am calling attention to the inaccuracies and inefficiency of the bureau. Commissioner Burke is a splendid commissioner, but he is not as big as the system which is 91 years old. It is bigger than Commissioner Sells or Commissioner Burke or any man put in that position. I say the money should be spent for schools, and my proviso is that it shall be expended for no purpose except that connected with the Indian children.

Mr. MURPHY. Again I want to say to my dear friend from Pennsylvania that we are just one jump ahead of him. The Indian Bureau appropriation for schools is based on the per capita attendance at each and every one of these schools, and the salaries of each and every teacher is enumerated, and every dollar of the Indian money has been protected as far as honest and intelligent effort could protect it. I think the gentleman's motion at this time is unnecessary.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. If I may have a moment more, I would like to say that in this bill there are appropriated over \$5,000,000, and I am in favor of the money being expended for the education of the children, and I am interested in the way the money was spent last year. If the Book of Estimates shows how the money was spent and the schools upon which it was spent, then it will be shown if any money was expended for the relief of other purposes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BURTNESS. Was Mr. Meritt's contention before the committee that the money could be spent for other than school purposes under the language used in this particular paragraph?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Absolutely; and I presume because of industrial purposes.

Mr. CARTER. It does not say industrial purposes; it says industrial schools.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. It is broad language.

Mr. BURTNESS. It is not as broad as the language in the bill of 1920.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. It is a case where the language is made very broad.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has read from some hearing in 1920, prior to the adoption of the Snyder Act in 1921. He quotes Mr. Meritt as stating under the language of the appropriation bill of that year that the money could be taken out of the support of schools and used for some other purpose not connected with the schools. Now, I asked the gentleman as to whether he had before him the language in the appropriation act of that year showing the language in the item under which Mr. Meritt said that could be done.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania did not understand my question and quoted another provision of the bill. I challenge the gentleman to produce the language of the bill corresponding to the item before us. I am safe in saying that under the language now in the bill, and put into this bill to conform to the Snyder Act, no money can be used for industrial purposes except in connection with the Indian aid to industrial schools. Now, I do not care what language he proposes to put in, he can only lumber up the paragraph; he can not make it any more clear than it now reads. What the paragraph was three or four years ago I do not know; the gentleman has not read it to the House. The money will not be used for industrial purposes except in connection with the schools, and we want them to teach the Indians how to care for stock and other industrial pursuits.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The gentleman knows there is a provision covering the industrial work in the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Apart from the schools, yes; but the money appropriated in this paragraph could not be used except in connection with the schools.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is what I am trying to do by this amendment.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania to read the language that was used as a basis for appropriation before the committee two or three years ago and upon which the interpretation was made by Mr. Meritt. The language now which the gentleman from Pennsylvania hands me as having been the language referred to reads as follows:

For support and civilization of Indians of the Klamath Agency, Oreg., including pay of employees—

And so forth.

If the gentlemen of the House will turn to page 58 of the present bill they will find precisely the same language:

For support and civilization of Indians of the Klamath Agency, including pay of employees—

And so forth.

The statement of Commissioner Meritt as to that language was absolutely right. That would be right under the language in this bill on page 58, but it would be absolutely wrong as applying to the language we are now considering on page 22. This language on page 22 provides that the appropriation may be made for support of Indians and industrial schools not otherwise provided for.

In this paragraph we have provided for schools not specifically referred to in the bill. There are many of them, many of 1 teacher and 20 to 30 pupils. In the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs will be found eight pages reciting the names and location of these schools and the number of children in attendance. Under the general law and through the provisions added to the paragraph we think we have thrown safeguards around the administration of the amount carried in the bill. Here we could not go into great detail with any particular profit. But when it came to other of the larger schools we called for comprehensive statements.

If the gentlemen of the House will be interested in turning to the hearings, not necessarily this big volume of estimates furnished to us by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs but the hearings themselves, they will find that following every particular item there will be a very closely itemized detailed statement of where these moneys were expended during the present fiscal year. For instance, on page 395, there is an Indian school in North Dakota—Wahpeton. There we have an appropriation of \$46,800 for the present fiscal year. We have here in the hearings 2 pages indicating in detail the various items included in the general total of figures that I have given, indicating salaries, wages, traveling expenses, transportation of supplies, and so forth, salary of the superintendent, financial clerk, teachers, principal, children enrolled, average attendance, and so on in as full detail as it would seem anyone could possibly desire.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. In a case of this kind where a department of the Government has submitted estimates to the committee showing how it proposes to expend this money, the department would not necessarily be bound by those figures, would it?

Mr. FRENCH. Those are estimates used as the basis for requests for appropriations. This is the policy that is followed by our committee: If a department shows that it has abused the trust of the Congress in failing to expend the moneys appropriated for the purposes indicated, the appropriations may not be made at all, and are not apt to be made for a succeeding year without a thorough understanding, and maybe not without a recital in the law itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. If the department found it necessary and useful to shift those appropriations from one institution to another, and it is of the same general object, I presume the committee would not complain?

Mr. FRENCH. We would complain, and, in fact, that would be impossible under the form in which this bill is written, because we make appropriations direct for the several Indian schools other than the small amounts that are carried generally in the bill for such purposes, as the chairman of the committee indicated awhile ago.

Mr. MADDEN. And it would be considered a breach of confidence on the part of the department to deviate from the understanding it had with the committee, and there would be retribution as the result of that breach.



Mr. FRENCH. There is no question about that.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is what I wanted to bring out.

Mr. FRENCH. And let me say this, that the language proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY], if it were to be construed in connection with the language used in the discussion, might hamper the department where it ought not to be hampered. For instance, in several of these schools there are gardens where a great amount of produce is raised annually for the support of the children within those schools. This goes to the cutting down of the expense of maintaining the schools. Unquestionably, in my judgment, the moneys could be used and properly used for the purpose of handling that work, which is ancillary to the conduct of the school itself, the schooling of the children in agriculture on the one hand and helping to cut down expense of maintenance on the other. I think the language goes too far, and while I do not think in general that the language perhaps vitiates the spirit in which this bill is written, and which will be followed in administration by the department, I do think it might lead to trouble in the expenditures of money provided for.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the section, and offer that as a pro forma amendment.

This bill carries for this item of support of Indian schools, \$1,799,500, which is \$124,500 more than the item was in the bill for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, and \$227,757 more than it was in the bill for the preceding fiscal year ending in 1922. The amendment which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] sought a few moments ago to have adopted would require next year in the estimates a detailed statement by the Commissioner of the Indian Bureau of how he was going to expend this vast sum of money. In defeating the gentleman's amendment, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] produced this volume of estimates which I have in my hand, and because of its great size they thought that it would overwhelm the gentleman from Pennsylvania as evidence of the fact that there has been a detailed statement. Let us look at the book and see what the book contains as to a detailed statement of this expense of \$1,799,500. Here is what it says:

Indian school, support: Analysis of expenditure.

Here is one of the detailed statements that the commissioner gives to Congress for us to pass on:

Miscellaneous, \$11,071.

Can the gentleman from Ohio tell us what the \$11,000 is spent for under the head of miscellaneous? What does "Miscellaneous" embrace? Then there is "Outstanding liabilities, \$107,219." What are these outstanding liabilities? Is the gentleman from Ohio prepared to answer? Is there a detailed statement for it? The gentleman from Pennsylvania was right when he sought to have a detailed statement put into this record. Then they have this:

Fuel and lubricants, etc., \$100,000.

That is a pretty high amount to be specified under those few words.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is there not light and power as well?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; fuel, lubricants, power, and light service. Then there is the item of dry goods, \$118,000, and there is transportation of supplies, \$60,000, which are rather indefinite.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. That is pretty general, is it not?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that they do not specify how much they are going to spend for calico and how much for gingham and how much for linen?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, that is facetious. It does not state in this great big volume how many teachers they have. That is what we want to know. It does not state how much salary they draw. That is what we want to know. We want to know how many teachers they have or how much they are paid, what is the maximum and what is the minimum, and we want to know what this "miscellaneous" is and the other very indefinite large items unitemized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Let us turn to the last item we passed on a few minutes ago, relieving distress, prevention of disease, and so forth. Let us see how they itemize that. "Miscellaneous, \$3,172.51." What is this miscellaneous? Then they have "Outstanding liabilities, \$32,600." What are the outstanding liabilities?

ties? In what way and for what did they incur these debts that they want money now to pay?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Is there anything in that book to show where the money was spent?

Mr. BLANTON. No. I challenge the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] now to show us in this book how many teachers they have for which they are expending in part \$1,799,500, or what salaries are shown in this book as paid to teachers? You can not show it at all. The committee has failed after all to have detailed estimates. The committee is not one jump in front of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]. The committee is just about 20 jumps behind him, if the truth were known; and because he is not a member of the committee, these five stalwart Members of the House who constitute the subcommittee ought to be willing to take a suggestion when it is sane from the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has studied this question, and not defeat his amendment by mere force, because they have the strength to do it.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I do so only long enough to say, because this record must be correct, that the \$1,750,000 to which the speaker referred several times is not \$1,750,000, but is in fact \$1,799,500 in the bill.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, when the time comes I want to say a few words on the provisos found on page 23, lines 3 to 13. This amendment but indicates the situation. It is unfortunate that some of the schools are not visited by the officials of the department or even by the committee. They do not see them all by any means.

Here is a provision that I want to call your attention to: A school with 79 pupils. Under this law it will have to be abandoned, with an expenditure of \$50,000 on behalf of the Government. Another one, a reservation school of 40 pupils, will have to be abandoned under this bill, with an expenditure already of possibly \$60,000 or \$70,000.

These are things that we know to exist. I have seen them. And yet they talk about that being economy.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I yield, of course.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman, of course, is aware of the fact that the proviso he speaks of has been carried in the bill for several years, and the schools have already been closed, except there might be an occasional one that would come within the limit which has not yet been closed.

Mr. RAKER. There is one that I speak of, and as to that, of course, I speak advisedly; I am personally familiar with it. We talk about being humane. We talk about legislating in such a humane way for these Indians. Here a school is closed where there are 79 pupils, with an expenditure already on behalf of the Government of, say, \$50,000. These Indian pupils must be sent away, not in the discretion of the department, but the Secretary must transfer them to certain other schools, as the provision provides. The pupils in schools so discontinued shall be transferred.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman has in mind the closing of the school at Greenville, in the gentleman's district?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman understands that that school has never been appropriated for under this item?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I know. That is the reason why I am taking a little opportune time on the question of education. I saw a school in Nevada where they sent some of these pupils from California. They sent some of these pupils up into a reservation in Oregon. They sent some of them into northern California. They sent some of them down to southern California, at the Riverside Institute. The Government pays for this expense.

Mr. CARTER. These children are taken from near their homes. Does the gentleman from California say these pupils were sent a thousand miles?

Mr. RAKER. That was a hypothetical question. But I think you can figure that the distance from Greenville Institute down to the Sherman Institute is, as I guess, about 700 miles by travel. I have traveled from northern California to San Diego—and that is by the only way we could travel—and it was eleven hundred and odd miles.

Mr. CARTER. It is not the language of the law that the gentleman ought to complain about, but it is the noncompliance with the language. The language is as plain as it can be.

Mr. RAKER. They shall be sent, first, to an Indian day school. You shut up one of those schools and then send them



to a State public school. The gentleman and myself knows that the people are not in a position to bear this burden, although they are struggling to give to the Indians all the assistance that they can, but they do not believe the Indians should be sent to the same school with the white children. It is not right and proper. You compel the Secretary of the Interior to do this.

Next to the adjacent reservation or nonreservation boarding schools, to the limit of the capacity of said school; and when you get to the limit, then poor little Mr. Indian does not get any consideration. You can figure on all the good things and you can say all the nice things you want, but I have been there and I have seen them, and I know what I am talking about. I have seen the Indian schools in Oregon and in Nevada and in California. I do not care to have you tell me what is done in these Indian schools and these day schools. I have seen them in the last 30 years, and I know their conditions of my personal knowledge.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. What becomes of the pupils where the schools are discontinued?

Mr. RAKER. There is a nonreservation school at Greenville, Calif. There are 28 public buildings there, property that has probably cost \$100,000 to the Government. You have an attendant there looking after it. They had a public building there for general school purposes. That was burned down by accident. Would the Congress or the Government pay out the money necessary to rebuild that school which was burned down by fire caused by an act of God? No; but they sent those pupils to Oregon and Nevada and scattered them over California. That is the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask for five minutes more.

Mr. CRAMTON. Reserving the right to object—and I do not wish to object—the gentleman knows we are proceeding by courtesy of the House.

Mr. RAKER. I do. That is true, but I have taken only a little time, and if I can have five minutes now, I will not take so much time when we get to the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Am I correct in understanding that where there are less than 8 children to attend a day school on a reservation, then the children are sent to a distance to be educated?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; they are scattered broadcast like a bunch of quail, depending a good deal on the feeling of the local superintendent. Some of them will be picked up and sent to Oregon.

Mr. WATSON. If there are more than 8 children they are taught on the home reservation, and if there are less than 8 then they are sent away.

Mr. RAKER. Yes. For instance let us go back to the Greenville Indian School, located in a delightful part of the State of California, in the home of the Indians, who have been there since before the first white men came there, some of the older people and their descendants. They held lands there which, of course, have been taken from them. They are trying to become civilized, and are doing the best they can.

These Indian pupils come from within a short distance of this school. The school was built there by the Government at the request of the Indians and of the other people. Unfortunately the main building burned down in December, 1921. There are 28 public buildings remaining there to-day going to waste and destruction. Those Indian children were sent, some of them to Oregon, some to northern California, some to southern California, some to Nevada; and I think, although I will not make the statement positively, that some of them were sent to Arizona—two or three of them. Now, that is not a question of economy.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman contend that the reservation and nonreservation boarding schools are better than the Indian day schools?

Mr. RAKER. They are all pretty good if they are properly taken care of.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The boarding schools take them away from actual home surroundings and really Americanize them?

Mr. RAKER. They are both good, but I am very much in favor of the day schools. I am in favor of the boarding schools

also, because they are both doing good work, but the nearer you can keep these children among their home people, where they do not have to go too far to get an education and to know how to do things in a civilized way when they go back and live with their parents, and then come to school every day; that is what you want, because I want to tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] that you can not take one of these Indian pupils away from his relatives and his tribe for five years and then send him back home expecting to get anything out of him. Any man who knows anything about human nature knows that, and when they write that they are going to civilize the Indians by taking them away for four or five years, that is all nonsense, unless you give him some care and attention after they leave school. You can not turn them loose like so many birds. The thing to do is to give them a chance to do the matters they will come in contact with in after life, and they should know something about this while they are getting a book education.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Let me read from page 137 of the hearings on this bill a statement of Commissioner Burke, in which he says that children in the reservation schools do not acquire the English language as they do if they go away from the reservation.

He says:

If you go to a reservation school and you hear them recite or you listen to a little program, you can tell right away that they have not been to school anywhere except in that one place. They do not broaden. They do not acquire the English as they acquire it if they get away from the reservation. Another thing which you can readily see: If a child goes to a school, we will say a day school or a public school, he goes at 9 o'clock in the morning and leaves for home at 4. He goes into an Indian home, and only Indian is spoken in the home, and necessarily he does not acquire English as rapidly as he would if he did not hear Indian or could not speak Indian when he was out of school.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I want to answer the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. About what age are these children?

Mr. RAKER. They run from 7 to 15 years of age. Now, anyone knows that an Indian, unless he is living with some of his people—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for one minute.

Mr. FRENCH. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] has called my attention to a statement where I used as an illustration the Wahpeton School as being suggestive of the items in this paragraph which we are discussing. If it had that implication at all, it should not have had, because we will come to that item in a later paragraph. I would say that in the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs there are eight pages that give, name by name, the schools all of which are included in this particular item that we have under consideration, not only showing the names but showing the number of pupils in each particular school.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I ask that the gentleman have one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho may proceed for another minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I want to get the record absolutely straight, because I believe the gentleman made a statement which was inaccurate. He made the statement that in this Book of Estimates there is a complete itemization of all the moneys in this general fund. He now states that it is given in the report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs does not give \$1 of the expenditure on these reservations. It shows the number of pupils attending, the number eligible, and the capacity of the school, but it does not show the amount of money spent, and that is what I was trying to get.

Mr. FRENCH. It gives the statement in a general way, touching the schools in this list, so far as this amount is concerned.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. But not on the reservations?

Mr. FRENCH. No. Not as to this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.



Mr. RAKER. I offer an amendment on page 23, in line 3, to strike out all after the word "children," commencing with the word "provided" down to and including the word "schools" in line 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAKER: Page 33, line 3, after the word "children," strike out all down to and including the word "schools" in line 13, page 23.

Mr. CARTER. I call attention to the fact that the word "schools" appears twice in line 13, on page 23.

Mr. RAKER. I refer to the last word "schools" in that line.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so modified. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Page 23, line 11, after the word "to," strike out the words "Indian day schools or."

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the proviso here provides that where these schools are discontinued, the pupils shall be transferred, first, if possible, to Indian day schools, or to public schools, and then to adjacent reservation or nonreservation boarding schools. As far as the other proviso is concerned, about the discontinuance of these day schools, it is rather farcical, when we remember that exactly the same provision was carried in the bill last year. That was for the fiscal year 1923. Now, exactly the same provision is carried for the fiscal year 1924. There is only one reason to-day for that in my estimation, and that is that once these Indian bills are framed they keep going year after year without subtraction, but always with additions. There are no schools having such a small attendance, so that that proviso is entirely unnecessary. But the question as to whether or not these children should be put in the day school is important. Commissioner Burke made a fine statement before the committee, in which he went further than I have. He said that this thought had been impressed on him within the last few years, that he had come in contact with many graduates of the old Carlisle schools; and wherever they might be, or whatever happened, there was one thing they did possess, and that was a complete mastery of the English language. They spoke that as well as we speak it.

Now, that is essential in connection with the civilization of the Indians. The Indian day school is exactly the opposite. I have seen a letter from a teacher of a day school in Arizona in which it is reported that the conditions were shocking; that the children came to school covered with lice, and it was necessary for the teacher to disinfect them; and then they would go back to the sheep, blanket and come back in the same condition.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman makes a distinction between the Indian day school on the reservation and the Indian day school off the reservation.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Well, the day school on the reservation is the one to which I refer. Mr. Burke has protested against it, and I think anyone familiar with it would rather see the children taken to the nonreservation boarding school than the day school on the reservation. My amendment changes the preference and makes the public schools the first preference if there are pupils transferred on account of the discontinuance of schools.

I submit that if the Indians could be put in the public schools—all of them—they would get the genius of our institutions and know the meaning of American ideals better than through tribal segregated schools. There are no graduates from the reservation day schools that can interpret for an American to an Indian or from Indian to American. Why? Because they do not have the American language, and without the American language they can not become real Americans.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania takes a great deal for granted when he says that the committee left language in the bill for no purpose. It shows that the gentleman has not studied the question that he discusses.

This item was in the bill last year. For what purpose? For the purpose of discontinuing all schools where the attendance fell below the point of 45 or 80 during the current fiscal year. It is in the bill this year for the same reason; that is, to force the discontinuance of schools falling below 45 or 80 during the next fiscal year. If the attendance falls

below 45 or 80 they ought to be discontinued. My friend from California [Mr. RAKER], who is trying to interrupt me, seems to have a grouse about the Greenville school. I want to call attention to the fact that the Greenville school was the most expensive experiment the United States ever undertook with education of Indian children, and the gentleman from California knows it, because the sum per capita for the time it ran cost more than any other school we ever had. Now, there is a purpose for having all these things in the bill. No nonreservation boarding school ought to be conducted with less than 80 pupils and no reservation boarding school should continue with attendance less than 45. It has been found that schools with such a small attendance are more expensive. They entail a much greater per capita cost. We have to keep the overhead expense going just the same as for a larger school. Therefore these things have not been left in the bill by any haphazard methods. They are there for a purpose, and that purpose is economy and efficiency.

I am surprised that my friend from California says that children have been carried—I think he said 2,000 miles at first, but amended that statement later by cutting it down to 800 miles—I think the gentleman must be mistaken about that, because the bill is perfectly plain in its direction. It says that pupils shall be transferred first to the Indian day school and then the day public schools, and second to the adjacent reservation or non-reservation schools. If they have been carrying children across one reservation to another, if they have been carrying them from one school to another farther on, then the law has been violated and the gentleman's complaint is not against the committee, not against the law, but against the administration of the law.

Mr. RAKER. If the gentleman will yield, I never made any complaint against the committee. I am trying to get results, and I hope when I try to present a matter here the committee will not think that I am against the committee. I am not against the committee or any individual. I love you all.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I thought that the gentleman wanted to ask a question. I have no time for the gentleman's felicitations. I took no offense at anything he said. My hide, like his, is thicker than an alligator's skin. I am trying to present this matter with what little emphasis there may be at my command to show to the members of the committee that these things were put in here with a purpose and what that purpose is.

Now, my friend from Pennsylvania has had some derogatory remarks to make about the day schools. While much can be said for the boarding school, the day schools also serve their purpose, and the value of that purpose can not be denied. The child leaves his house and comes to the day school about 8.30 to 9 o'clock in the morning. It returns to the little Indian home about 4 o'clock in the afternoon. When he returns to the cabin or tepee he carries with him some of the education; some of the civilization he has absorbed during the day. His mother, father, and other members of the family have an opportunity to observe and absorb a part of that; so the day school carries its civilizing influence beyond that which the pupil itself attains on to all other members of the family and to the tribe.

Just as strong a defense of the day school can be made on the grounds of economy. It costs a little above \$2 per month to keep the average Indian child in the day school, while it costs about \$25 at the boarding school. At this rate 10 may be educated in day schools for the cost of 1 in a boarding school. Then, again, the child in the day school is not wholly dependent on the Government for everything. He returns home for his meals, his parents furnish his clothes, he is in a more independent environment, and his parents are not completely relieved of all responsibility for his conduct, demeanor, and subsistence.

The public school is, of course, the ultimate goal where the Indian youth may be educated alongside his white brother. But until the Indian child is properly equipped, until public schools are available, the Indian schools must be continued; and the day school and the boarding school both have their place in the general scheme. Neither interferes with the other. It would be more proper to say one is the natural complement of the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INDIAN SCHOOL AND AGENCY BUILDINGS.

For construction, lease, purchase, repair, and improvement of school and agency buildings, including the purchase of necessary lands and the installation, repair, and improvement of heating, lighting, power, and sewerage and water systems in connection therewith, \$350,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the payment of salaries and expenses of persons employed in the supervision of con-



struction or repair work of roads and bridges and on school and agency buildings in the Indian Service: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to allow employees in the Indian Service, who are furnished quarters, necessary heat and light for such quarters without charge, such heat and light to be paid for out of the fund chargeable with the cost of heating and lighting other buildings at the same place: *And provided further*, That the amount so expended for agency purposes shall not be included in the maximum amounts for compensation of employees prescribed by section 1, act of August 24, 1912.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the proviso.

Mr. CRAMTON. Against all three of the provisos?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. On what grounds?

Mr. RAKER. Legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. We will consider the point of order as pending. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TOWNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13559 and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee as indicated below:

S. 4172. An act to authorize the building of a bridge across the Great Pee Dee River, in South Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 3295. An act to consolidate the work of collecting, compiling, and publishing statistics of the foreign commerce of the United States in the Department of Commerce.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RICKETTS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 23 they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills and joint resolutions:

H. R. 12174. An act to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land of the United States to Fulton County, Ga., to widen McDonough Road in front of the United States penitentiary;

H. R. 8996. An act to amend section 5211 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 7912. An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in sums not exceeding \$1,000 in any one case;

H. R. 5349. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to settle claims for damages to private property arising from collisions with naval vessels;

H. R. 3034. An act for the relief of Lizzie Askeli;

H. J. Res. 279. Joint resolution to permit to remain within the United States certain aliens admitted temporarily under bond in excess of quotas fixed under authority of the immigration act of May 19, 1921; and

H. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution extending the provisions of the act of February 25, 1919, allowing credit for military service during the war with Germany in homestead entries, and of Public Resolution No. 29, approved February 14, 1920, allowing preferred right of entry for at least 60 days after the date of opening in connection with lands opened or restored to entry to citizens of the United States who served with the allied armies during the World War.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, December 28, 1922, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

853. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend section 3 of the act approved September 14, 1922 (Public Law No. 299, 67th Cong.); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

854. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report showing what officers of the Gov-

ernment were delinquent for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1921, in rendering or transmitting their accounts, together with a list of such officers as were found upon final settlement of their accounts to be indebted to the Government and who at the date of making this report have not paid such indebtedness into the Treasury of the United States (H. Doc. No. 519); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

855. A letter from the national commander of the American Legion, transmitting report of proceedings of the American Legion for the year 1922; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 13580) to authorize the National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children to sell and convey certain real property in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 13581) to provide hospital and dispensary treatment for all disabled veterans by the United States Veterans' Bureau; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 13582) granting a pension to Elida G. Cusick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 13583) granting a pension to Harlin Seaggs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13584) granting a pension to Margaret Wellman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13585) granting a pension to William Justice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 13586) for the relief of Glenn D. Good; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 13587) granting a pension to Kate Bantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13588) granting a pension to Leo Forst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 13589) for the relief of Alice Sarrazin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROSENBLUM: A bill (H. R. 13590) granting a pension to Mary C. O'Donnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 13591) granting a pension to Sophronia Brigham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 13592) granting an increase of pension to John S. Furling; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6682. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of 86 residents of Vallejo, Calif., protesting against excise tax on small ammunition and firearms; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6683. Also, petition of 42 citizens of Vallejo against section 900, paragraph 7, of the internal revenue bill, being the tax on firearms and ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6684. Also, petition of 22 citizens of Richmond and Oakland, Calif., against section 900, paragraph 7, of the internal revenue bill, being the tax on firearms and ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6685. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the United Commercial Travelers of America, Tri Council, No. 166, of Rock Island, Ill.; Southern Supply & Machinery Dealers' Association, of Richmond, Va., and Mobile, Ala.; and Haddorff Piano Co., of Rockford, Ill., favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6686. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of J. W. Paxton and 10 other cotton growers of Dunklin County, Mo., urging legal protection of quail as destroyer of the boll weevil; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6687. By Mr. KAHN: Petition of United Veterans' Council of the city and county of San Francisco, State of California, urging the repeal of section 4 of the act of Congress approved August 23, 1912 (37 Stat. 413), relative to retired enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.



6688. By Mr. ROSSDALE: Petition of the Drug and Chemical Section of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, protesting against the enactment of the Ernst-Wood bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

6689. By Mr. SWING: Petition of Pioneer Citizens of the Imperial Valley, State of California, favoring the passage of House bill 11449; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, December 28, 1922.

(Legislative day of Wednesday, December 27, 1922.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ball	Gerry	McCormick	Pomerene
Borah	Glass	McCumber	Sheppard
Brandagee	Hale	McKellar	Shortridge
Brookhart	Harris	McKinley	Smoot
Cameron	Harrison	McNary	Spencer
Capper	Heflin	Moses	Stanfield
Caraway	Hitchcock	Myers	Sterling
Colt	Johnson	Nelson	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	New	Townsend
Cummins	Kellogg	Nicholson	Trammell
Curtis	Kendrick	Norbeck	Walsh, Mont.
Dial	Keyes	Norris	Warren
Dillingham	King	Oddie	Watson
Ernst	Ladd	Page	Weller
Fernald	La Follette	Pepper	Williams
Fletcher	Lenroot	Phipps	
France	Lodge	Polindexter	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily detained on account of illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read a letter which I have received from the President of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the letter. The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, December 27, 1922.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: Replying to your inquiry relative to the proposed amendment to the pending naval bill authorizing and requesting the President to call an economic conference to deal with conditions in the war-torn nations of Europe I write to say that I know of no prohibition against such an expression on the part of the Congress, but I do frankly question the desirability of such an expression. I think it is undesirable because of the false impressions which may be conveyed thereby to Europe, and even more undesirable because of the wrong impression it conveys to our own people.

On the face of things it is equivalent to saying that the executive branch of the Government, which is charged with the conduct of foreign relations, is not fully alive to a world situation which is of deep concern to the United States. As a matter of fact, the European economic situation has been given most thorough and thoughtful consideration for many months. Without questioning the good faith of the proposal I am very sure it would have been more seemly, and the action of the Congress could be taken much more intelligently, if proper inquiry had been made of the State Department relative to the situation in which we are trying to be helpful.

Of necessity the communications of the State Department relative to delicate matters among nations can not be bulletined from day to day, but the situation is never withheld from Members of Congress who choose to inquire for confidential information in a spirit of cooperation. Such inquiry would have revealed the futility of any conference call until it is understood that such a conference would be welcomed by the nations concerned within the limits of discussion which the expressed will of Congress compels this Government to impose.

In ratifying the treaty of peace with Germany the Senate made a reservation that the United States should not be represented on the Reparations Commission without consent of Congress, and no such consent has been given. Moreover, in creating the World-War Debt Funding Commission that body was restricted to explicit terms for rates of interest and ultimate time of payment. If Congress really means to facilitate

the task of the Government in dealing with the European situation, the first practical step would be to free the hands of the commission so that helpful negotiations may be undertaken.

It is quite generally accepted that the adjustment of the question of reparations must underlie any economic rehabilitation of Europe, and reparations can not be settled without the consent of governments concerned. The United States can not assume to say to one nation what it shall pay in reparations nor to another nation what it shall accept.

In discussions with foreign governments the previous administration and the present administration have insisted that the question of European debts to the United States is distinct and apart from the question of reparations, but European nations hold a contrary view, and it is wholly inconsistent to invite a conference for the consideration of questions in dealing with which the Government is denied all authority by act of Congress.

So far as the limitation of land armaments is concerned, there seems to be at this time no more promising prospect of accomplishment than when the conference was held in Washington a year ago. Here, again I venture to warn the Senate against the suggestion to our own people or a gesture of promise to the world which can not be fulfilled until the nations directly concerned express their readiness to cooperate to such an end.

With respect to a limitation of auxiliary types of naval craft, which are not limited by the present naval treaty, it is to be said that such an agreement is much to be desired, whenever practicable, but we may reasonably postpone our further endeavors along that line until the agreements made at the Washington conference secure the final sanction of all governments concerned.

Very truly yours,

WARREN G. HARDING.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

### PETITIONS.

Mr. PHIPPS presented a resolution unanimously adopted at the member's council meeting of the Denver Civic and Commercial Association, favoring the enactment of legislation extending liberal and adequate credit facilities to farmers and stock raisers, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HALE presented a resolution adopted by the New York State Conference, National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring the maintenance of a strong Navy adequate to the national defense, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pontiac, Mich., praying that the United States protect the Armenians from persecution and massacre, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4235) granting consent of Congress to the Charlie Bridge Co. for construction of a bridge across Red River between Clay County, Tex., and Cotton County, Okla.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 4236) granting a pension to Abner C. Hill (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 4237) to control the operation of motor vehicles in the District of Columbia, to provide for indemnity bonds or insurance policies, to fix penalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 4238) granting an increase of pension to Samuel E. Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 4239) authorizing officers who were retired for incapacity resulting from an incident of the service before July 1, 1922, to be given the same pay, according to longevity, as if retired after June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 4240) granting a pension to John R. Scott; and A bill (S. 4241) granting a pension to Fred D. Carlos; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

A bill (S. 4242) for the relief of Major V. Hampton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.